

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS WHEN PAID IN ADVANCE.

Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter, 52s., including double numbers and postage.
Solicitors' Journal, town, 26s.; country, 28s.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, APRIL 23, 1864.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR delivered an oration on Thursday evening in the House of Lords, in eulogy of the Land Transfer Act, and the department established by his Lordship for carrying into effect the provisions of that statute. The speech was very able, eloquent, ingenious, and somewhat sarcastic, as most of his Lordship's speeches are. It was, however, much more specious than logical; for while on the one hand he insisted that the measure was really successful because "very nearly two millions worth of property had been brought into the office within sixteen months," on the other hand he met the arguments of those who characterise the whole measure as a failure, by saying that solicitors are to blame for it—that they are "the real obstacle to a general registration of title." Now, on both these points his Lordship seems to have been carried away by his ardour as an advocate, not less than by the parental affection with which he regards his favourite legislative offspring. As to the value of the property "brought into the office" being "very nearly two millions," it must be borne in mind that these large figures include all pending applications, many of which will no doubt be withdrawn, or not prosecuted with success, and that, from the establishment of the office in 1862, down to the last Parliamentary return, which was made only a few weeks ago, the total value of the registered property was considerably under £100,000. As to the opposition of the lawyers, about which the Lord Chancellor was so very trenchant, his Lordship appears to have forgotten that among the commissioners whose Report in favour of registration greatly facilitated the passing of the measure now under consideration, were two solicitors, and that some of the most earnest advocates of a well considered scheme for facilitating the transfer of real property belong to the same profession.

A SELECT COMMITTEE has been appointed to consider and report upon the defects in the Bankruptcy Act, 1861, but as their report will probably not be presented for some weeks, it is not likely that there will be any legislation on the subject during the present session of Parliament. Remark on the present condition of things in the Court of Bankruptcy, the *Times* says,—

In the year 1862 the number of adjudications of bankruptcy, as returned by the chief registrar, was 9,653, of which nearly 7,000 occurred on the petition of the debtor himself. What is still more remarkable is that in 550 only of these cases was there any dividend whatever made for the benefit of creditors. In 6,910 instances there was absolutely nothing forthcoming—not even a farthing in the pound. Nevertheless, we discover, on pursuing the analysis, that 6,053 discharges were granted and only 154 refused. It certainly seems at first sight to result from these facts, both that the "ventures" leading to bankruptcy must be singularly desperate, and that the desperation is not regarded as very culpable. In 1863 there was a little improvement. The number of adjudications in that year was only 8,470, and nearly 1,000 cases (996) produced a dividend. The dividends, too, were a little better, and so we cannot be surprised that the number of discharges was as large as before, and the number of refusals smaller.

Now, what do these figures teach us? Should as many as 7,000 traders "smash" so completely in one single year as to leave not a penny for their creditors? Is this a fair average? Is it the actual average? Financial authorities tell us that there are, undoubtedly, tides in these affairs. They are as obscure and unintelligible to us as the tides of the sea were to Virgil; but their existence is said to be beyond question.

Even their periods are known. Ten years, we are told, or about that time, may be expected to bring about a flow and an ebb—a glut of money, and a collapse; and immense expansion of enterprise, and a commensurate product of bankruptcies. Then, where are we now? Do 10,000 bankruptcies, of which 7,000 are without assets, speak of good times or bad? Do they represent a maximum or a minimum? It would be hard, perhaps, to answer these questions accurately, but the figures are rather surprising to ordinary people. More than half these failures, it is true, were for small sums, but that does not affect the principle of the matter. The bankruptcy, without a sixpence to show for it, still remains. Are we to suppose that this very fact explains the bankruptcy, and that if there had been anything divisible among creditors the bankrupt would have been kept out of court? If so, it is certainly not unreasonable that inquiry should be made into the operation of the Bankruptcy Act.

It must be remembered that the Act of 1861 was, in some important respects, very different from the bill introduced by the present Lord Chancellor, then Attorney-General, who considered that the appointment of a chief judge was absolutely necessary for the satisfactory working of the district courts. There is no department of law in which, for years past, there has been so much investigation, or in which so many reports of committees and associations have been made with so little result. As far as the lawyers are concerned, the great diarepute of the Court of Bankruptcy, and the enormous expense of its administration, are most injurious to them, for the result is to prevent a resort to the court in the great majority of cases where its procedure and process ought to be invoked.

THE NECESSITY for the constitution of a special department and minister of justice becomes every day more apparent. It has long been felt by lawyers and others who are concerned in the administration of the law. While the present state of things exists, they feel that the expurgation of the statute book, the consolidation of the statutes, and all such devices for simplifying the *Lex Scripta*, must end in disappointment, and be comparatively useless. Hardly an important statute passes without betraying the want of adequate supervision, and the result is unnecessary complexity and confusion where there is no occasion for either; and there appears to be little chance of obtaining the required reform so long as the evil is confined to courts of justice and to private individuals. But when we find one of the Houses of Parliament betrayed into the commission, or, at least, the allowance, on the part of one of its prominent members, of a palpable misdemeanour involving serious penalties, there may be some chance of inducing the Legislature to bestow upon the question the notice which it demands. On Monday evening last, Mr. Disraeli called the attention of the House of Commons to the fact that, for some time past, there has been a systematic violation of an Act of Parliament by various distinguished members of the House with the sanction of the Government for the time being, and without any protest from either side, or even the Speaker himself. During the present session of Parliament, five under-secretaries of state have been sitting in the House of Commons, although it is not yet six years ago since it was enacted by the 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 4, that, after the commencement of that Act, any four of her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State for the time being, and any four of the under-secretaries, for the time being, to her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, might sit and vote as members of the House of Commons, but not more than four such principal secretaries, and not more than four such under-secretaries should sit as members of the House of Commons at the same time.

It is admitted on all hands, that the plain and express provisions of this recent Act of Parliament has been violated, and the only question is, as to who is to blame, except, indeed, that Mr. Disraeli, with great ingenuity, suggested various possible awkward results

as the effect of the resolution which he proposed. Referring to the division upon the yeomanry question, in which the Government majority was only one vote, he said—

The motion was connected with the office of the Secretary of State for War, and upon it the under-secretary for that department, representing the policy of the Government, spoke with all the authority and influence which a person holding office must have on such a subject. But not only did he speak, he voted. We were defeated by one vote, and yet it turns out that at that very time the under-secretary, who took that influential and decided part upon the question, had no more right to speak—had no more right to sit in this House—had no more right to vote than the stranger who at this moment is passing over Westminster-bridge.

Mr. Disraeli suggested other instances of the same kind for the purpose of showing the serious consequences involved in the illegality of which ministers were thus guilty. Lord Palmerston merely contended that the Opposition were fairly liable to share the blame with the Government. The matter is referred to a select committee of the House, and no doubt a bill of Indemnity will be passed, for the purpose of saving whichever Under-Secretary may be exposed to the heavy and accumulated penalties imposed by the statute. Indeed, it appears to be doubtful whether all the under-secretaries are not equally liable, and whether in addition to the statutory liability, they have not forfeited their seats in the House. However this may be, it is certainly a serious scandal that the Government itself should have been guilty, however unwittingly, of the violation of a most important statutory enactment, and that the illegality should have so long remained undiscovered in a Parliament, the majority of whose members must have personally participated in framing the statute. If the Legislature itself is not cognizant of that portion of the statute law which more immediately concerns the functions of Parliament and the Constitution there is something very unreasonable in holding the great bulk of the people responsible for obedience to a much larger and more complicated body of law. With a department and minister of justice, it would have been hardly possible for Parliament to have got into the unfortunate position in which it now finds itself. The old adage that "what is everybody's business is nobody's business," has for the thousandth time received illustration, and so forcibly this time that it ought to convey a wholesome lesson to our Legislators.

THE COURTS OF JUSTICE CONCENTRATION BILLS will probably be laid before Parliament in the course of next week, and it is said to be the intention of the Government to press forward the measure during the present session.

THE CASE OF *YOUNG v. FERNIE*, which has already occupied the attention of Vice-Chancellor Stuart for twenty-seven days, is not yet concluded; but, as there are only four witnesses now remaining to be examined, it is expected that next Wednesday will see its termination. We shall give an account of this remarkable case in our next number.

MR. HENRY MILLS, Q.C., formerly of the Norfolk Circuit, who lately succeeded Sir Mordaunt Wells, as one of the puisne judges of the Supreme Court at Calcutta, died a few days after his arrival there.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM AND TEWSON, Auctioneers, have announced for sale, in lots, a freehold estate in Kent, with a registered and indefeasible title under the new Act. We believe this is the first estate which has been brought into the market with a registered title under the Act.

THE ALEXANDRA CASE.

The great length of the report, extending to twenty-six columns, contained in the last number of the *Weekly Reporter*, of the judgments given in the House of Lords in *The Attorney-General v. Sillem*, may render an abridg-

ment of them acceptable to our readers, as the judgments, although given on a point not of common occurrence, contain much useful matter concerning legal procedure and the interpretation of statutes.

LORD CHANCELLOR.—The question is whether the rules of November 4, 1863, of the Exchequer (granting an appeal on the revenue side on discharge of a rule to show cause for misdirection) are warranted by section 26 of the Queen's Remembrancer's Act (22 & 23 Vict. c. 21). Appeal from common law decisions on motions for a new trial, or on rules to enter a verdict or nonsuit, was created by the Common Law Procedure Act, 1854. The creation of a new right of appeal is an act requiring legislative authority. Either court or both cannot create it. The fullest power as to practice would not avail for the creation of that which is a limitation of one jurisdiction and an extension of another. Accordingly, section 36 of the Common Law Procedure Act, 1854, bound the appeal courts to entertain the new appeals from the common law courts. That Act intentionally excluded appeals from the revenue side of the Exchequer; a further legislative Act would be required to include them. If the 26th section of the Queen's Remembrancer's Act has given such legislative authority to the barons, it has done a thing which, in matters affecting taxation, would seem very improbable. The improbability is increased when section 10 of the Queen's Remembrancer's Act expressly applies to the revenue side the provisions as to error and appeal in section 46 of the Common Law Procedure Act, 1852, and section 32 of the Act of 1854. Sections 12 to 15 of the Queen's Remembrancer's Act create and regulate new rights of appeal; section 16 makes express extensions of the Act of 1854 to the revenue side, also sections 18 and 19, and by section 20 appeal to a court of error on a bill of exceptions is created on the revenue side. Error between the Crown and the subject having thus been put on the same footing as between subject and subject, it is difficult to resist the impression that the appeal from interlocutory orders, given by sections 34 and 35 of the Act of 1854 were intentionally omitted, unless there be a clear enactment to the contrary. But the powers of the barons, by section 26 of the Queen's Remembrancer's Act, are—1, to make rules as to the process, practice, and mode of pleading on the revenue side; 2, to extend, apply, and adapt to the revenue side any of the provisions of the Common Law Procedure Acts, and any of the rules of the pleading and practice on the plea side as may seem expedient for making the "process, practice, and mode of pleading on the revenue side as nearly as may be uniform with the process, practice, and mode of pleading on the plea side." Uniformity of process, practice, and pleading is the object. It is difficult to give the words different meanings in the two powers. Practice is the *cursus curiæ*, or regulation of proceedings within the court itself. Then, do sections 34—36 (the sections applied by the rules in question to the revenue side) of the Act of 1854, creating new rights of appeal, make provisions respecting process, practice, and mode of pleading? An appeal is the right of entering a superior court, and invoking its interposition to redress the error of the Court below. The mode of proceeding may be regulated partly by the practice of the inferior, and partly by the practice of the superior, tribunal; but the appeal itself is wholly independent of these rules of practice. The right to bring an action is distinct from the regulations of the action when brought. These rules, creating new relations between courts, are as distinct from rules of practice as international from municipal law. They are not provisions relating to the practice of the Exchequer Court on the revenue side. The third rule is, that the Court of Error, the Exchequer Chamber, and the House of Lords shall be the courts of appeal; and rules 6—9 prescribe the duties of those courts. The principal argument of the Attorney-General was, that "process, practice, and mode of pleading" are equivalent to "procedure," denoting the whole course of a cause. But the words are

not here used in the abstract. They always have reference to some court, and so have a definite and well-understood meaning. Upon that argument the barons would have power to make rules of procedure for the House of Lords. The argument that proceeding to error is now made a "step in the cause"—that is, a step in procedure as equivalent to process, practice, and pleading, and, therefore, a step within the meaning of these words—rests on the same fallacy of taking the words abstractedly. It was further argued that, as by section 20 of the Queen's Remembrancer's Act the proceeding by bill of exceptions is extended to the revenue side, by which error of a judge at the trial may be brought before a court of error, the giving an appeal from the judgment of the Court in *banc* on the same question of error in the ruling, is no more than a regulation in form. But, in point of fact, the appeal is from a different judgment. The answer, however, to the argument is, that the express mention in the Queen's Remembrancer's Act of the proceeding by bill of exceptions, contrasted with the silence of that Act as to the appeals given by sections 34 and 35 of the Act of 1854, confirms the conclusion that the Legislature deliberately abstained from extending to suits on the revenue side the provisions contained in those sections.

The objection that, even if the barons had power to make the rules, they had no power to make the rules apply to pending proceedings, is not well founded. Still it is a subject of deep regret that any rules should have been made expressly with a view to the determination of a particular case.

LORD CRANWORTH.—The second rule of the Exchequer, giving an appeal on the discharge of a rule to show cause on the ground of misdirection, was warranted by section 26 of the Queen's Remembrancer's Act, if the rule would tend to make the practice on the revenue side more nearly uniform with that on the plea side. It did so if "practice" means procedure till final judgment. In a remedial Act we may adopt this liberal interpretation. Even supposing "practice," in the Queen's Remembrancer's Act, to be confined to that in the Exchequer itself, still the rule tended to make more uniform the practice on the two sides of the court. The power is not one to introduce clauses relating to process, practice, and pleading, but one to make them more uniform. On the plea side, the suitor may bring misdirection at the trial under review of the courts of error, either by a bill of exceptions at the trial, before verdict, and then by proceedings before the Exchequer Chamber and House of Lords; or, after verdict, by motion for a new trial, with like appeals. On the revenue side, before the Exchequer rules, either party might tender a bill of exceptions, and so bring the matter before the courts of error; but if he preferred to move for a new trial, he could not question, in the courts of error, the judge's ruling. The new rules made the mode of bringing the judge's ruling before the courts of error the same on both sides of the court. This may surely be treated as an alteration of the practice in the court itself. It makes the practice more uniform on the two sides of the court itself. But, supposing that to be so, still it is said that no power of making such rules was intended to be conferred on the barons; first, because it is absurd to suppose such a delegation of power to be extended to the judges; secondly, because there are clauses in the Queen's Remembrancer's Act itself inconsistent with such a hypothesis. On the first ground, there are, certainly, cases where strict adherence to the language of a statute would lead to such absurdity or inconvenience as to make it necessary to understand the words not in their ordinary sense; but there is not any such necessity here. Suppose the power had in terms included those provisions of the Common Law Procedure Act which related to appeals, what would there have been absurd or inconvenient in such an enactment? Consider, first, when the Court's decision conforms to the judge's ruling, and

a new trial is refused. The very question as to which appeal is given by the Exchequer rule might have been brought by bill of exceptions under review of the same courts. The rule gives a right to proceed on appeal instead of by the more cumbrous and complicated mode of exceptions. It gives to the suitors on the revenue side the same facilities for getting out of the court below and reaching the courts of error which are possessed by the suitors on the plea side. It does not give, substantially, any new right of appeal. Next, where the Court decides against the judge's ruling, the party dissatisfied would be compelled to go down to a new trial, where, of course, the judge would state the law to be as settled by the Court; the other party might then tender a bill of exceptions and so bring the question before the courts of error. The rule enables him to bring before those courts, on appeal, the same question as otherwise he might have brought, on exceptions. In either case the effect of the rule is the same. It is true that, on a bill of exceptions, the duty of the Court of Error is simply to award or to refuse a *verdict de novo*, but, on appeal, it is bound to give such judgment as the Court below ought to have given. But it cannot be an argument against the rule that it enables more substantial justice to be done by the Court of Error. There is, therefore, no anomaly in such a power as that exercised by the Exchequer. As to the second argument, derived from other clauses of the Queen's Remembrancer's Act, that, where a right of appeal was intended, it was given expressly, this assumes that, but for those other clauses, section 26 would authorise these rules. Then, have those clauses such an effect that section 26 must be read as if there were in it a proviso declaring that nothing therein contained should enable the barons to make a rule empowering a suitor on the revenue side to bring before the courts of error any ruling of a judge at *Nisi Prius* otherwise than on a bill of exceptions? There was no such effect. The clause giving the right to tender a bill of exceptions on the revenue side was necessary, for there would have been no right under section 26 to extend to the revenue side the provisions of the Statute of Westminster; the only clause really raising any question on this part of the argument is the 10th. All that can be said is, that there is one case specially provided for by the Legislature, for which the judges, under their general powers, might have made adequate provisions. As to the operation of the rule on pending, as well as future suits, the authorities show that new rules may so operate.

Next week we shall give an abridgment of the other judgments in this famous case.

REAL PROPERTY LAW.

DISABILITY OF LUNATICS, ALIENS, AND CORPORATIONS.

In order to complete the outline of the law relating to persons under disability (either absolute or relative) to enter into any contract about land, which has lately appeared in these columns, we ought to add a few words upon each of the above-mentioned heads.

1. As to lunatics and persons of unsound mind. Before a person is found lunatic by inquisition, the presumption of law is in favour of his sanity; after that, the presumption is against his sanity; but the inquisition is not conclusive upon persons who may be interested in maintaining the contrary, as, *ex gr.*, upon a person who entered into a contract with, or took a conveyance from, the lunatic, after the date at which the finding fixed the commencement of the lunacy. This was clearly laid down in *Snook v. Watts*, 11 Beav. 108, and in *Jacob v. Richards*, 18 Beav. 300, on app., 5 D. M. & G. 55. But even if it should be held (upon an issue raised as to the sanity of an alleged lunatic at the particular date of the contract) that he was *then* of unsound mind, that would not of itself be sufficient (as the law now stands) to avoid the contract, if the other contracting party were

not aware, when the contract was entered into, of the unsoundness of mind, and if the contract was in all respects fair and *bonâ fide*. This rule was established by *Moulton v. Camroux*, 4 Exch. 17, which has been since followed by *Beavan v. Macdonnell*, 10 Exch. 309, and was also cited with entire approval by Lord Cranworth in *Elliot v. Ince*, 7 D. M. & G. 475. It is now, therefore, well settled that an executed contract, where the other contracting party has been dealing fairly and in ignorance of the lunacy, cannot afterwards be set aside, especially if, in respect of the subject-matter of the contract, the parties cannot be placed in the same position as they were in before. But where there is not evidence of entire good faith, or where there was knowledge of the mental incapacity, the contract will be set aside, unless it be for the benefit of the lunatic that it should be maintained.

In the case of *Beavan v. Macdonnell* the contract was not entirely completed, and yet the Court upheld it. There a lunatic contracted for the purchase of an estate, and paid the deposit; and the Court of Exchequer held that the deposit could not be recovered back, because the vendor had treated entirely in good faith, and in ignorance of the infirmity of the lunatic. *A fortiori*, where a person is of sound mind when he entered into a contract, but imbecility of intellect subsequently intervenes; that fact will not alter the rights of the parties, and so the contract will be deemed to be valid, unless it be impeachable on other grounds, and it has so been held: *Hall v. Warren*, 9 Ves. 605, where the question was as to a contract entered into by a lunatic (so found) during a lucid interval. Sir W. Grant, M. R., there said, "The law upon this subject is, that all acts done during a lucid interval are to be considered done by a person perfectly capable of contracting, managing, and disposing of his affairs at that period."

So much for the contracts of lunatics; but, of course, there may be other attempted dealings by a lunatic besides those of contract, and it has properly been considered that the same reasons which go to uphold "contracts" entered into with persons of unsound mind in good faith, and in ignorance of the fact of the unsoundness, do not apply in other cases; as, for example, in the case of a voluntary settlement of the lunatic. In the case of contract the rule is obviously a reasonable, if not a necessary, one; but neither justice nor policy requires that it should be extended in favour of mere volunteers; and this was the opinion of Lord Cranworth in the case of *Elliot v. Ince*.

It is not correct to say that any deed made by a person who has been found lunatic is necessarily void. Although the finding of the lunacy shifts the burden of proof upon the person who wants to maintain the deed, yet a lunatic, whose lunacy is not superseded, may unquestionably, during a lucid interval, make a valid will; and Lord Cranworth, in *Elliot v. Ince*, evidently inclined to the opinion that, upon the same ground, he might, during a lucid interval, make a valid deed; and this, indeed, is implied in the more general proposition laid down by Sir William Grant, already cited.

ALIENS.

An alien friend (*i.e.*, the subject of a friendly State resident in this country), has the same power of entering into and enforcing personal contracts as a natural born subject of the Queen. By the common law he may purchase, but he cannot hold, any real estate or chattel real, with the exception of a lease for years of a house for the convenience of merchandise. If he purchase real estate, the property will be forfeited to the Crown on office found, or on the death of the alien, which shall first happen; but, until office found, the property remains in him. If the alien were to sell or devise the property, the Crown might, nevertheless, upon office found, seize the land in the hands of the purchaser or devisee, just as it might have done in the hands of the alien himself. An alien cannot take lands by inheritance; but it was held, in *Du Houmelin v. Sheldon*, 4 My. & Cr. 525, that he

might take under a will the produce of real estate thereby devised to be sold. Neither is an alien at common law capable of transmitting by descent. We shall see that certain Acts of Parliament have removed, or rendered capable of being removed, some of these disabilities, and particularly the last-mentioned; but it is, of course, desirable to know what the law is, independently of these statutes.

The important question whether a trust of land for the benefit of an alien is capable of taking effect, was some time ago raised in two cases, one before Vice-Chancellor Stuart, and the other before the Master of the Rolls, and decided oppositely. In *Ritson v. Stordy*, 3 Sm. & Giff. 230, Vice-Chancellor Stuart held that a trust to convey to an alien was incapable of taking effect for the benefit either of the alien or of the Crown, and that the beneficial interest resulted to the heir of the deviser. In *Barrow v. Wadkin*, 24 Beav. 1, however, the Master of the Rolls held the opposite of this. His Honour's decision was that the Court of Chancery would enforce for the benefit of the Crown a trust of real estate created in favour of an alien; and that the devise being valid, and there being a *cestui que trust* who could take, but not hold, there was no resulting trust for the heir-at-law, nor could the trustee himself take beneficially, but that the Crown would have a right to enforce the execution of the trust, and so would be entitled to the beneficial interest.

As to the statutes in favour of aliens, the 11 & 12 Will. 3, c. 6, enables a natural born subject to derive title by descent through an alien ancestor. This Act was explained by 25 Geo. 2, c. 39; and now the 7 & 8 Vict. c. 66 enables an alien to get letters of naturalization, whereby he becomes capable of holding real estate, acquired after that time; and the same statute confers similar immunity (without letters of naturalization) upon aliens born of an English mother. It also enables alien friends to hold land or houses for a term not exceeding twenty-one years for the purpose of residence, occupation by himself or his servants, or of any business, trade, or manufacture.

CORPORATIONS, &c.

Although a corporation may enter into a contract for the purchase of land, yet it cannot hold it in its corporate capacity, except under a licence in mortmain, or under the provisions of a special Act. This is the general rule, but there are some exceptions, *ex. gr.*, incorporated charities may now hold land in certain cases with the consent of the charity commissioners (without licence in mortmain). A still more important exception is made by the Companies' Act, 1862, s. 18, which confers powers on companies under the Act (which are in fact corporations) to hold lands.

Convicted felons who are attainted—*i.e.*, sentenced to death—are, in respect of their real estate, in the same position as aliens who have not received letters of naturalization. By common law, descent could not be traced through an attainted person. 54 Geo. 3 repeated this rule except as to treason *petit*, treason, murder, and abettors. Now, by the Inheritance Act (3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 106, s. 10), descent may be so traced. The Crown or the superior lord has a right to any freehold estate of which the felon was seised at the time of conviction, and an inchoate right at the time when the crime was committed (and any leaseholds and other chattels of which he was possessed are forfeited on conviction), and a purchaser before conviction, even if *bonâ fide*, and without notice, would take, subject to the inchoate rights of the Crown. But in case of felony not involving capital punishment, a valid conveyance of land may be made by the felon, even after the conviction.

CONVEYANCES IN MORTMAIN.

Re the Governors of Christ's Hospital, V. C. W., 11 W. R. 669.

The question involved in the present case is one which, although of considerable practical importance, has been

regarded as doubtful by many members of the profession for some time past. It is this:—Suppose a railway company, or other company armed with the compulsory powers of an Act of Parliament, takes land belonging to a charity, and that the money paid by the company is expended in the purchase of other lands to be conveyed to the charity. Does this conveyance require enrolment to avoid the operation of the Mortmain Act, 9 Geo. 2, c. 36? By that Act it is provided that all grants, conveyances, &c., of any lands to a corporation, or to any persons in trust for a charity, shall be void, unless certain conditions are complied with. One of these conditions is, that the indenture of conveyance be enrolled in chancery within six months after the execution thereof. It has, however, been doubted whether conveyances, which were made under the circumstances above-mentioned, such as re-investments of money paid into court, were within the Act, so as to require enrolment. It was argued that the object, or one of the objects, of the Act of 9 Geo. 2 was to prevent more land being brought into mortmain, but that, in the case contemplated, the quantity of land in mortmain would not be increased; inasmuch as the transaction was really equivalent to an exchange. All doubts on the point have, however, been removed by the present case, in which the facts were shortly as follows:—The City Commissioners of Sewers, acting under the powers of 57 Geo. 3, c. 29, purchased lands belonging to Christ's Hospital, and paid the purchase-money into court. It is provided by that Act, that the purchase-money for land so taken shall be laid out in the purchase of other lands, to be conveyed to the same uses, upon the same trusts, &c., as those upon which the land taken stood settled or limited at the time. The governors of the Hospital accordingly, with the consent of the Court, invested the money in the purchase of other lands, and caused the conveyance of such other lands to them to be enrolled. The Commissioners, who were bound to pay the costs of re-investment, objected to pay the costs of the enrolment. The taxing master, however, allowed the costs; and the point was argued upon a motion to vary his certificate by disallowing the costs of the enrolment. Wood, V.C., dismissed the motion, stating his very decided opinion that the enrolment was necessary. He said that enrolment was, by the Act of Geo. 2, above mentioned, made part of a complete and valid conveyance to charitable uses, and that, if the conveyance was not enrolled, the grantor or his heir might eject the charity from the lands. It may be assumed that, in future, enrolment will, in all cases, be carefully attended to; but we believe that it has been omitted in a large number of cases, in which the six months limited for that purpose by the Act of Geo. 2, have long ago expired. It becomes, therefore, a matter of considerable importance to all who have been concerned in similar transactions, and who have neglected enrolment, to inquire whether there are any means of remedying this defect in the title. The Act of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 9, provides a remedy against this mischief in the case of all instruments executed before the passing of that Act—the 17th of May, 1861. The Act (section 3) provides, in effect, that no deed made before the passing of the Act shall be void for want of enrolment, if it be enrolled within twelve months after the passing of the Act. The time here given was enlarged by the subsequent Act of 25 & 26 Vict. c. 17. The preamble of this latter Act refers to the Act of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 9, and states that, from the great number of deeds to be enrolled under the provisions of the Act referred to, it was reasonable to allow an extension of time for that purpose. The Act then goes on to provide, that the enrolment of every deed, assurance, and instrument, which shall be enrolled before the 17th of May, 1864, shall, for the purposes of the said Act (24 & 25 Vict. c. 9), have the same force and effect which it would have, had, if such enrolment had been within twelve months next after the passing of the said Act. The Act of 25 & 26

Vict. appears only to apply to the same instruments as the former Act, to which it refers—that is, to deeds executed before the 17th of May, 1861.

A bill has been introduced into Parliament by Lord Cranworth, during the present session, to extend the time limited by the Act of 25 & 26 Vict. for two years more. This bill also appears only to apply to deeds executed before the passing of the first Act, 24 & 25 Vict.

The result of the different Acts appears to be this:—Any conveyance executed before May 17th, 1861, which shall be enrolled before the 17th of May next, will be valid. If the enrolment be postponed beyond that day, the deed will be void under the 9 Geo. 2, unless the bill now before Parliament become law, in which case it will be sufficient, if the enrolment takes place before the expiration of the further period allowed by that Act. With regard to deeds of conveyance executed after the 17th of May, 1861, which have not been enrolled within six months after execution, they would appear not to be aided by either of the Acts above mentioned, nor to be included in the benefit proposed to be conferred by the bill now before Parliament, and to be, consequently, void.

It is to be feared that there are not a few deeds of the same character as that, which came under the consideration of the Court in the present case, in this unfortunate position. It is, on all accounts, desirable that the decision in the present case, and the conclusions which follow from it, should be known to the profession as soon as possible.

COURTS.

On the first day of Easter Term the judges breakfasted with the Lord Chancellor, and then proceeded in state to Westminster Hall to open the courts. The ceremony, aided by the fineness of the weather, attracted a considerable crowd to the hall. It was about two o'clock before the legal business of the courts began.

COURT OF CHANCERY.

(Before the LORD CHANCELLOR.)

April 15.—Mr. Serjeant Parry, having obtained a patent of precedence, and Mr. Keane, and Mr. Field having been appointed Queen's Counsel, presented themselves before his Lordship, and were called within the bar.

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH.

(Sittings in Banco, before the Lord Chief Justice Cockburn and Justices BLACKBURN, MELLOR, and SHEP.)

April 15.—*Ex parte Dickson.* In the matter of two Attorneys.—This was an application on the part of Lieutenant-Colonel Dickson, who, it will be remembered, was plaintiff last year in two actions against the Earl of Wilton, Lord Combermere, and General Peel, directed against two attorneys who had acted for him in those actions. One of these actions against the Earl of Wilton, Lord Combermere, and General Peel was commenced in February, 1862, and was tried in this court in the summer of last year; and the trial took up not less than eight or nine days, and resulted in a verdict against Colonel Dickson and in favour of all three of the defendants. According to Colonel Dickson's statement, he had paid £500 to the attorneys for disbursements in the actions; and, pending the trial, they applied to him for at least £300 more, expressly to meet the fees of counsel, especially the "refreshers," to which they are entitled on each day of an adjourned trial. They applied to him, he alleged, for money to pay these "refreshers," stating that counsel would require them to be paid daily, and that they would amount to £80 a-day, and the attorneys added that they could not afford to expend so much money out of their own pockets, in "a case they considered so extremely doubtful." He paid them, consequently, as he alleged, the sum of £300 further, for these fees, and he had thus paid them on account of disbursements in the action, the sum of £800. Immediately after the trial of the first action, and the adverse verdict thereon (the other being abandoned), they sent a written bill of costs to Colonel Dickson, amounting altogether to £1,815, and including the sum of £833 charged as disbursements in the action tried, and especially including counsel's fees and "refreshers," which, however, had not then, it turned out, been paid. Colonel Dickson,

however, "not being (as he alleged) aware of this," did not oppose the taxation of costs, on which the master allowed £1,778, including the sum of £385 charged for "refreshers" as paid to counsel. On this a judge's order was obtained in the usual course for a judgment to that amount. This was at the end of August last (the trial having taken place in June) and an appointment was at once made with Colonel Dickson by a clerk of the attorneys, upon his going to attend which (as he stated) he was arrested for that amount. He remained in custody until September, when he obtained his release through the Court of Bankruptcy; and, in the course of the proceedings in that court (as he stated) he discovered, for the first time in November last, that these fees or "refreshers" had never, up to that time, been paid. Upon that he applied in the first instance to the Law Institution; but, in the result, made an affidavit with a view to application to this Court, and upon an affidavit setting forth the facts as above stated.

Mr. Hawkins, Q.C., now moved on his behalf for a rule calling on the attorneys to show cause why the master should not be at liberty to review his taxation of costs, and why the order to sign judgment for the amount taxed, and the judgment and writ of execution thereon should not be set aside; and why the attorneys should not answer the matters stated. The learned counsel stated that the main ground of the application was that an imposition had been practised upon the master, by inducing him to suppose that these fees had been paid, whereas they had not been. It was true, indeed, that they had been paid subsequently, but that was after Colonel Dickson's discovery of the non-payment, and after proceedings were apprehended. The bill of costs charged, in the most precise manner, payment to counsel of these "refreshers" on each day, and, indeed, charged "attendance" in each instance for the purpose. Nearly £400, as Colonel Dickson stated, was overcharged in the bill as actually paid in excess of what really had been paid; and to that extent the learned counsel contended that the taxation of costs and judgment had been improperly obtained.

The Court granted a rule nisi.

April 16.—*Ex parte the Hon. James M. O. Byng.*—Mr. Bovill, Q.C., moved, on behalf of the above-named gentleman, a brother of the Viscount Torrington, a barrister of the Middle Temple, and chairman of the South-Eastern Railway Company, for a rule, calling upon a person of the name of Hamilton, a shareholder in the company, to show cause why a criminal information should not be filed against him for the publication of a libel reflecting upon the chairman and other directors of the company. Mr. Hamilton had been brought before the Court, on a former occasion, for having published a libel against the officials of this company, and he had apologised and agreed to pay all the costs, but he had now issued a further libel affecting the conduct of the directors. The half-yearly meeting of the company was held on the 25th of February. There had been some arrangement entered into between the South-Eastern Company and the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway company, but it had not been made known to the shareholders or to the public, for obvious reasons. Mr. Hamilton attended the meeting, and the report having been read, he commenced reading a voluminous document; he addressed his observations, he said, to gentlemen who were not on the register. He was interrupted and informed that there were none such present, as the company were in the habit of issuing orders of admission to their shareholders, and care was taken that none but shareholders and the representatives of the press should be admitted. Mr. Hamilton continued his address until a resolution was passed that his remarks were irrelevant, and he should not be allowed to proceed further. Mr. Hamilton then addressed a letter to the *Railway Times*, which occupied eleven columns, as an advertisement, in which he charged Mr. Byng and the other directors with carrying measures with fraud and violence, by most illegal conduct, and most unheard-of means; that the board employed braves; that a conspiracy was entered into by the board to defeat the proprietors; and he asked if the law could not crush such conspiracies. If the criminal law could not crush such delinquents it was very defective, and he was ready to subscribe £500 towards the expenses of their prosecution. He spoke of one of the directors as a railway gladiator, and that means were taken to introduce persons to the meetings who were not on the register.

The Court observed that there were other means which the parties might resort to. All that this amounted to was, that this person had not been heard at the meeting, and that he used the words conspirators and gladiators; he took advantage of the presence of a gentleman who was supposed not to

be on the register, to use this foul-mouthed language. These were wholesale vituperations that only recoiled upon the person using them.

Mr. Bovill urged that the charges were very serious, and that the directors were justified in asking for the special interference of the Court.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE said he thought this was not a case in which the Court ought to interfere. He could not help thinking that the ordinary remedies, both civil and criminal, were open to the parties aggrieved. The letter of Mr. Hamilton was certainly very abusive and vituperative, but it only came in substance to this—that he chose to assume that persons who had no right to be at the meeting prevented him from addressing it. The charges were completely met and answered by the affidavits of Mr. Byng and the other directors. It occurred to him, on hearing what Mr. Bovill had read, that there was not any foundation for the charge Mr. Hamilton had thought fit to prefer. At all events, the directors had had an opportunity of denying it on oath. If he might use the expression, Mr. Hamilton's letter was a publication too contemptible to call for the interference of that Court by the prerogative writ of criminal information.

Rule refused.

—*In re Sharp.*—This case raised an important point under the Divorce Act with reference to orders made at police-courts for the protection of married women. These orders are obtainable by married women, either from the Divorce Court or a police-court, upon satisfactory proof of desertion, &c., and the Divorce Act provides that the orders may be rescinded upon application to the court or the magistrate or justices. In the present case an order had been obtained by the wife of one Sharp from the late Mr. Paynter, at the Westminster Police-court, in the year 1858. The husband, as he stated, did not hear of it until October last, and then he applied to the then sitting magistrate at Westminster (Mr. Paynter having in the meantime died) to rescind the order. The magistrate doubted if he had jurisdiction according to the terms of the Act, and thought that the application must be to the same magistrate. An application was then made to the Judge-Ordinary of the Divorce Court, who, however, thought otherwise, and deemed the jurisdiction to be in the magistrate for the time being at the police-court where the original order was made, and he accordingly declined to make any order, except that the matter should be referred to the magistrates at the Westminster Police-court. Upon the matter being again brought before them, however, they differed in opinion as to whether they had jurisdiction, and desired that an application should be made to this court.

Application was now made for a rule for a mandamus to the magistrates of Westminster Police-court, directing them to hear and determine the application on the part of the husband to rescind the original order of protection. Otherwise the husband would have no remedy in any case in which the magistrate who had made the order had died.

The Court thought the matter one fit for consideration, and granted a rule nisi.

April 18.—*Hudson v. Slade, Bart., and Others.*—This was the celebrated action against the benchers of the Middle Temple for causing the plaintiff to be assaulted and given into custody. The matter arose out of an inquiry which was going on before the bench as to the conduct and character of a barrister. In the course of that inquiry the present plaintiff was examined as a witness, and a letter-book of a certain company with which he had been connected, and of which the benchers had become possessed, was produced in cross-examination. In the course of the cross-examination he claimed the book as his own, and put it in his pocket. They directed their porters to retake it, and then the assault complained of took place. The action was tried at great length before the Lord Chief Justice at Guildhall, in December, 1862, and the jury could not agree. The case came on again for trial in July last, and it was referred by consent to the arbitration of Sir J. T. Coleridge, formerly a judge of this court. The order of reference ran thus:—That on reading the pleadings, the letter-book, and the evidence (as printed) on the former trial, he should say what, if anything, should be done between the parties. Sir J. Coleridge accordingly considered those matters, and, in October, 1863, made this award:—"I hereby say and determine on the matter so referred to me as follows; but considering the subject so referred, I think it proper to premise that a cause of action was proved, not in every particular justified, but with so much of extenuation on the one side and of provocation on the other, that a verdict with nominal dam-

ages would have been proper to be found by a jury, coming to the same conclusions as I do upon the facts, and it would not be equitable that the plaintiff should pay the defendants any costs. A stay of proceedings, therefore, would, in my opinion, bring the action to its proper termination; but, considering the relative positions of the parties and all the circumstances, I say and determine that the plaintiff and the now surviving defendants (Sir F. Slade having, unhappily, died in the meantime) shall mutually execute releases of all causes of action arisen or supposed to have arisen, between them down to the time in question, and that in the release to be executed by the plaintiff there shall be expressed a withdrawal by the plaintiff of any imputation of want of honour or good feeling on the part of any of the defendants for their conduct on the occasions in question as having been made in anger, and without due consideration, and that the defendants shall, immediately on his execution of that release, pay to him the sum of £50." The plaintiff, when this award was made, was in Australia, and only returned in February, just at the close of last term, and he now appeared in person to move to set it aside.

Mr. Hudson, in support of this application, urged that the award was inconsistent, inconclusive, and in excess of the arbitrator's powers. It found a cause of action and yet awarded no damages, except as conditional upon the execution of a release which he could not possibly execute, for he could not possibly withdraw imputations for which he believed there was some just foundation.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE said that, as the reference to Sir J. Coleridge was to say what was fit to be done by the parties, his powers were quite large enough to authorise him to direct mutual releases to be executed. As to the plaintiff's execution of the release, however, it was only made a condition of his receiving the money; and if he did not choose to execute the release, the only consequence would be that he would not receive the money. The award was distinctly that no damages were due to him as a matter of right, and it was entirely on another ground, and on condition of his executing the release, that the money was awarded. No application was made by the benchers to enforce the award or obtain the release, and no doubt the benchers would be willing to sheathe the sword and let matters rest as they were if the plaintiff was willing that it should be so, and that was what the arbitrator deemed the right termination of the matter. There was no reason, therefore, to disturb the award.

Mr. Justice BLACKBURN concurred.

The other judges had withdrawn from court.

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.

(Sittings in Banco, before Lord Chief Justice ERLE, and Justices WILLES, BYLES, and KEATING.)

April 15.—Shortly after the sitting of the Court, Mr. J. J. Simon, Mr. Pulling, and Mr. Tindal Atkinson, having taken the oaf, Mr. Serjeant Parry, having obtained a patent of precedence, Mr. D. Keane and Mr. Field, having been appointed Queen's counsel, took their seats within the bar.

COURT OF EXCHEQUER.

(Sittings in Banco, at Westminster, before the LORD CHIEF BARON, Mr. Baron MARTIN, Mr. Baron BRAMWELL, and Mr. Baron FIDGOTT.)

April 18.—In the matter of Alfred Leigh, an Attorney.—Mr. Garth, on behalf of the Incorporated Law Society, moved for a rule calling on the attorney to show cause why he should not be struck off the roll of attorneys of this court, or why an attachment should not issue against him, and why he should not pay the costs of the application as well as the costs of one John Walker.

The matter was referred by the Court to the master to inquire into and report upon, and, this having been done, to-day Master W. F. Pollock read his report.

It appears that the attorney had been instructed by Mr. Walker, upon the recommendation of a friend and neighbour, to recover some property to which Mr. Walker believed himself entitled. The attorney, from time to time, obtained about £130 from Walker, and issued a writ in ejectment and signed judgment, which judgment was subsequently set aside by Mr. Baron Martin. No writ of possession was ever issued, and no subsequent proceedings appear to have been taken by Mr. Leigh in the matter. Mr. Walker, who is a retired small farmer residing at East Retford, and a very infirm and illiterate man, complained of the attorney's conduct.

Although the master made repeated appointments in order that the whole matter might be thoroughly gone into and

sifted, Mr. Leigh, it appears, did not think it necessary to attend any one of them, but sent in an affidavit which ran to a considerable length. The learned master, having perused the affidavit, reported that it contained no answer to the charges of fraud and extortion made against Mr. Leigh.

When Master Pollock had concluded his report,

Mr. Garth asked that the rule should be made absolute, and it was made absolute accordingly.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

(Before Mr. Commissioner FANE.)

April 18.—*In re A. D. Hughson*.—The bankrupt was described as of Capel-court, City, and elsewhere, commission agent, stockbroker, and Scotch attorney. He now applied for his release from custody.

From the statements made to the Court, it appeared that the bankrupt was the plaintiff in the recently-tried action against Mr. W. F. Windham, of Fellbrig Hall. The claim of Mr. Hughson was for services rendered to Mr. Windham with reference to proceedings in the Divorce Court, and the trial of the cause having occupied a considerable time, the jury returned a verdict in favour of Mr. Windham. The bankrupt was subsequently arrested for the costs of the action, and he still remained in custody at Mr. Windham's suit. On behalf of Mr. Windham it was now contended that the bankrupt was a mere man of straw, and that the action had been most improperly and unjustifiably brought. For the bankrupt it was urged that he had a fair ground of action against Mr. Windham, and that no valid objection could be made under the 112th section of the Bankrupt Law Consolidation Act, 1849.

Mr. Commissioner FANE declined to interfere until after the meeting for choice of assignees.

Application refused.

MANSSION-HOUSE POLICE COURT.

April 15.—Mr. Wm. Harding, a builder, residing at Lee, attended before Mr. Alderman Rose, on a summons charging him with using abusive and threatening language towards Mr. Pulling, a solicitor, of Adelaide-place, London-bridge.

Mr. Pulling deposed that he had had occasion to issue a writ against the defendant, under the Bills of Exchange Act, which was served upon him on the 31st ult. On the 12th inst. the defendant called at his office. Witness's office and that of his clerks' communicate by a door having glazed panels. He heard a knock at the door, and his clerk said he was not in. He was about to go out and correct his clerk in that respect but, before he could do so, the defendant walked in, and said "Here you are." He asked his business, to which the defendant replied that he had called to pay him £49. Witness said that further costs had been incurred, and that that was not the amount due; whereupon the defendant raised his hand in a threatening manner, and, calling him a rogue, a swindler, and a scoundrel, said he would ruin him, and he then rushed out, and went down stairs, shouting as he did so. He believed that the defendant would do him some injury, and he went in bodily fear of him. Witness, in cross-examination, said he had known the defendant in former actions. The writ in this case was endorsed £44 9s. 10d. He had heard him talking to witness's clerk before the defendant walked into his room; but he did not hear him offer the clerk any money. The defendant produced no money to him (witness); he said he came to pay £42.

The defendant explained that, having been served with a writ by Mr. Pulling, he called twice at his office on Monday; but, not finding him in, he left word that he would call next morning, and he did so. Before seeing Mr. Pulling he left the copy of the writ which had been served upon him with his clerk, a boy of fourteen, who endorsed it with a receipt for £45; but the clerk had not at the moment a receipt stamp, so that the matter remained unsettled. No demand was made upon him for more than £45. On Tuesday he called twice before he could see the complainant, and before he entered his room he had tendered £45 to the clerk. The boy replied that his master being absent he could not receive the money. Witness saw the complainant's shadow on the glass door, and the door being ajar, he walked in and offered him £45. The complainant refused to take it, upon which witness called him a good-for-nothing fellow, and threatened to strike him off the rolls. As he said that he held the door by one hand and the money in the other. He denied lifting his hand to him in a menacing way, or being nearer to him than twelve or fourteen feet. Mr. Pulling had previously told him that the costs were £5, and witness, not expecting that he would have more cost

to pay, thought the complainant was trying to get money from him by false pretences.

Alderman Rose directed the defendant to enter into his own recognisances in £20 to keep the peace towards the complainant for six months.

MIDDLESEX SESSIONS.

April 18.—Mr. Harry Palmer said he was requested by Mr. Bassett, a solicitor, of Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn-fields, to state that he was now present and ready to offer any explanation to the Court which might be required in reference to the cases of George Farmer, Thomas Featherstone, and William Taylor, in which he was instructed to prosecute.

The Assistant-Judge said the costs of Mr. Bassett were refused because the Court had been informed that it was the practice of certain persons to attend the police courts of the metropolis to make arrangements with police constables who were concerned in cases, and to induce prosecutors to allow them to undertake to engage counsel for the trial, upon the understanding that no expense beyond the county allowance would be incurred. Mr. Bassett wrote to the Court indulging in all kinds of threats which were to be carried out if the refusal to allow costs was persisted in. Inquiries were then directed, and it was found that in each of the three cases mentioned, Mr. Bassett, or the man representing him, had solicited the prosecutors in the way described. The police had interfered to obtain the prosecution for Mr. Bassett, and their conduct would be reported to the proper authorities. The Court would do all they could to discourage these practices, and Mr. Bassett would certainly not be allowed any costs.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

TITHE RENT-CHARGE—COST OF APPORTIONMENT.

It not unfrequently happens that a small portion of land, subject to a tithe rent-charge, is sold amongst several purchasers. I should feel obliged if I could, through your Journal, get an idea of the probable cost of an apportionment of such charge by the Tithe Commissioners, as the whole amount of the rent-charge is frequently not more than five or six shillings.

April 19.

A SUBSCRIBER.

DOWER.

In reply to "J. T. S.'s" query, in your last week's number, I think it quite clear that Simons' widow is not, under the circumstances stated, entitled to dower.

Although there was no written contract by Poxon to purchase of Simons, yet as the whole of the purchase-money was paid, and as (I assume) possession was delivered to the former, there was a sufficient part performance of the parol contract to take it out of the Statute of Frauds, and to render it a valid contract. See Sugden's "Vendors and Purchasers," 13th ed., pp. 123, 124.

And, as all contracts to which the land is subject are, under the new law, valid as against the widow's right to dower (*ibid.*, p. 172), Simons' heir-at-law is bound to convey to Poxon, free from such dower.

A. X.

Derby, April 20.

Upon payment of the purchase-money, Simons held the moiety of the close of land purchased in trust for Poxon.

Before the passing of the statute 3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 105, the wife of a trustee in fee was at law entitled to dower, but a fine was, on that account, never required by a purchaser, because if the wife of a trustee were so ill-advised as to prosecute her legal claim, equity would saddle her with all the costs. The statute before referred to has not altered the law in this respect. See *Noel v. Jean*, *Bevan v. Pope*, 2 Free. 43, 71; *Lloyd v. Lloyd*, 4 Dru. & War. 354; and 3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 105.

J. O. M.

April 20.

THE MIDDLESEX SESSIONS.

The following letter has been addressed by Mr. Bassett, solicitor, Carey-street, to the *Times* :—

In reference to that portion of the report of the proceedings at the Middlesex Sessions, inserted in your columns of to-day, referring to myself, I desire to offer a few words of explanation.

No clerk of mine, nor any person representing me, ever had any authority from me to acquire business by irregular means,

and I am assured by my managing clerk that not any such were used.

As to the "threats" to which Mr. Bodkin alludes, no threats were used by me. In justice to myself, and regard to the profession to which it is my privilege to belong, I did say that if it became a rule of Mr. Bodkin and the officers of the Middlesex Sessions to refuse costs in cases in which I conducted the prosecution as attorney, then I should feel it my duty to make a representation elsewhere.

It is apparent that if the presiding judge and officers of the Middlesex Sessions are to refuse costs to some solicitors and grant them to others, such a court must become a close, and probably a corrupt, corporation.

Principle, rule, and their application I understand, and shall not object to be guided thereby; but the whim, caprice, prejudice, or, it may be, interest of the officers of any court affecting my practice in the profession to which I belong I shall not submit to without, at least, complaint and remonstrance.

I trust to your sense of justice for the insertion of this letter.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES BASSETT.

16, Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn, April 19.

RIGHT TO FISH IN NAVIGABLE RIVER.

I fish in the Trent, but my limits are confined by alleged claims of the riparian owners to rights of fishery. The Trent being navigable, I take it that the presumption is strongly against any private fishery, and that the foundation for such a right must be a real or presumed grant from the Crown before Magna Charter. I should like to have answers to the following questions on the subject:—

1. What proof must be given to raise a presumption of a Royal grant?

2. Where there is no private fishery, may the public anchor in the stream in order to fish? N.

April 21.

CANADIAN COMMISSIONER FOR TAKING AFFIDAVITS.

I enclose you a notification for publication in the *Solicitors' Journal*, which may prove a source of great convenience to the members of our profession, as well as to our clients. Those who have been called upon to advise in Canadian matters know the difficulties we have had to encounter in verifying documents. Although I am, at present, the only duly constituted commissioner, still you may apprise your subscribers that the intention is to have commissioners appointed in the principal towns where dealings with Canada take place.

CHARLES BISCHOFF.

19, Coleman-street, London, E.C., April 16.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. JAMES BIRD, coroner for the western division of Middlesex, has been appointed deputy lieutenant of the Tower Hamlets.

Mr. EDMUND BOYLE CHURCH, of the firm of Messrs. Church, Prior, & Bigg, has been appointed chief clerk in the chambers of the Master of the Rolls, in the place of the late Mr. Whiting, deceased.

PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, April 15.

SETTLED ESTATES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

This bill was read a third time and passed.

CHARITABLE ASSURANCES ENROLMENT BILL.

This bill was also read a third time and passed.

Tuesday, April 19.

LAND SECURITIES COMPANY BILL.

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH moved the second reading of this bill.

Lord REDESDALE opposed the second reading. This was simply a money-lending company, and there was no public object involved in the measure. The transactions of such a company ought to be regulated by public law, and not by private legislation.

The LORD CHANCELLOR thought his noble friend had taken rather an erroneous view of the matter. They could not legis-

late upon a subject until it had come into being. His noble friend might as well have said that when the first railway bill came before the House, it ought not to have been passed until there had been public legislation for the regulation of railways. He (the Lord Chancellor) looked upon this bill as the commencement of a series of great measures that would be of great benefit to the landed interest, by giving the greatest possible facility for raising money. The bill had passed through a sifting investigation in the House of Commons, and if it were now read a second time, there would be no objection to its being referred to a select committee.

Lord CRANWORTH suggested that the bill be read a second time that day fortnight, so as to enable their lordships in the meantime to examine its provisions. This would give them an opportunity of considering whether the bill ought to proceed or not.

Earl GREY did not think that the House was in a position to decide upon the bill, and recommended it to be referred to a select committee, and if possible to the same select committee to which the Improvement of Land Act (1864), the second reading of which the noble lord on the woolsack was about to move, would be referred.

The Earl of MALMESBURY said a difficulty might arise in the attempts to carry out the noble earl's (Grey's) suggestion, owing to the fact that this was a private, and the bill of the noble lord on the woolsack a public bill. If the bill were sent to its own select committee, this would not prevent the other bill from proceeding *pari passu*. He feared the restrictions placed round landed proprietors, in the efforts of the Legislature to relieve them, put them in the position of men in armour, whose panoply was impenetrable to club or steel, but who were so encumbered by their own defences that they could not move.

Earl GRANVILLE said the bill might be read the second time on the understanding that it be referred to a select committee. Great care must be taken, as the present bill would form a precedent for other companies.

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH said he was anxious to follow the course marked out, and would have no objection to refer the bill to a select committee.

Lord REDESDALE, in withdrawing his amendment, said if the provisions of the bill were right, they ought to pass as a public and not as a private measure.

The bill was read a second time.

IMPROVEMENT OF LAND ACT (1864).

The LORD CHANCELLOR, in moving the second reading of this bill, explained that it consisted of two great divisions, and the first one embodied all the provisions that had been found most beneficial in the numerous drainage Acts, but the present bill extended very largely the purposes of those Acts. Those Acts had hitherto applied only to the drainage of land, whilst it was clear that there were many other things equally important; and the present bill would facilitate the borrowing and paying of money required for such improvements. The bill also was accompanied with many greater safeguards than existed at present. The first security required by the bill—which was to be worked by the Enclosure Commissioners—was the report of an assistant commissioner that the proposed outlay would increase the annual value of the land to an extent more than equal to the interest of the money to be raised; the principle of the bill being that the land should be chargeable with a terminable annuity in respect of the outlay. Thus, if £2,000 were to be borrowed, there would be created one of £100 for twenty-five years. There were other provisions in that bill which would enable a landowner to arrange with the tenants for an augmented rent, in proportion as the works were completed. The second division of the bill originated in a report made to their Lordships last session by a committee appointed to inquire whether it would be proper to give power to landowners to charge their estates with terminable annuities for the purpose of purchasing shares in railways which were likely to benefit the land. That committee stated that, in their opinion, it would be quite possible to ascertain the augmented value to be derived from an estate from a railway passing through or near it with the same certainty as the improved value to be derived from drainage of buildings could be ascertained. The present bill proposed to apply the same machinery in reference to the construction of railways as was provided in the former part of the bill; and, in like manner, there must be a report from the assistant commissioner that the land must be benefitted by the construction of railways either then in progress or about to be commenced. It was further provided that the railway should be completed

and open for public use before any final charge could be made upon the land, the charge being limited to five per cent. upon the amount subscribed. There were particular provisions to facilitate arrangements with the tenants; that the railway shares should be issued proportionately to parties paying off the annuity. The great object to be attained was the accuracy, certainty, and workability of the bill; and, as the subject required most careful consideration, he would suggest that the bill should be referred to a select committee. The policy of recent legislation had been to increase the power of the tenant for life, and this bill was a step in the same direction. There was another question which certainly required consideration, and that was in reference to the law as to waste. A tenant for life might suffer an estate to go to utter decay, and there was no law to enable the remainderman to compel him to perform what was plainly his duty. What was called actual waste exposed the tenant for life to legal consequences; but permissive waste was something for which there was no remedy to the remainderman. Not only might ordinary waste be allowed, but the tenant for life might, in consideration of a larger rent, allow the farmer so to cultivate the land that he would take the heart out of it, and indeed such cases were not rare. He hoped that the select committee would take care that, while the tenant for life obtained the advantages which the bill proposed to give him, correlative duties should be imposed upon him. He had omitted previously to state that any person interested in land, and objecting to the exercise of the power of the commissioners under this bill, would have a summary and expeditious mode of appealing to the court of chancery.

After a few words from Lord BERNERS and the Marquis of BATH, in approval of the principle of the measure, it was read a second time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, April 15.

BARNSTAPLE ELECTION COMMITTEE.

Mr. HOWES brought up the report of the select committee appointed to try the merits of the last return for Barnstaple. The committee reported that Mr. Lloyd had not been duly elected, and that Mr. Bremridge was duly elected, and ought to have been returned to serve in Parliament for this borough. The committee had further to inform the house that several persons not entitled to vote had voted at the said election, and that several electors had received sums of money, varying from £5 to £10, for the purpose of influencing their votes. The committee had agreed to a resolution that Mr. Lloyd had, by his agents, been guilty of bribery at the last election, but there was no evidence to prove that he was personally engaged in carrying out the same; and the committee had further agreed to a resolution that they had no reason to believe that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed at the last election for the borough of Barnstaple.

ASSIZE TOWN FOR THE WEST RIDING.

Colonel EDWARDS, in the absence of Sir J. Hay, asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he would lay upon the table of the house a copy of the letter from the chairman of the West Riding quarter sessions, recently held at Pontefract, and of the resolution passed there on the subject of the assize town for the West Riding of Yorkshire.

SIR G. GREY said he had no objection to lay upon the table a copy of the document to which the gallant member referred.

THE NEW LAW COURTS.

Mr. A. MILLS asked the First Commissioner of Works whether the Government had abandoned the intention of introducing any measure for the concentration of the courts of justice. The owners of property on the proposed site had been kept in suspense for three years, and one owner of seventeen houses, who had previously an income of something like £2000 a-year, was now almost reduced to beggary by the indecision of the Government.

Mr. COWPER.—Her Majesty's Government have not abandoned the subject. It is now under consideration, and I hope will shortly be brought forward.

Mr. MILLS.—During this session?

Mr. COWPER.—Yes.

COPYRIGHT (No. 2) BILL.

This bill was read a second time, and referred to a select committee.

Monday, April 18.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. BREMIDGE took the oaths and his seat for Barnstaple, in the room of Mr. Lloyd, who was unseated on petition.

The hon. member was introduced by Mr. Whitmore and Mr. Trefusis.

Wednesday, April 20.

FORFEITURE OF LANDS AND GOODS BILL.

On the order of the day for the second reading of this bill, The ATTORNEY-GENERAL wished a postponement of this bill, in order to give time to consider amendments.

Mr. C. FOSTER consented to postpone the second reading till June 18.

JOINT-STOCK COMPANIES (VOTING PAPERS) BILL.

This bill was read a second time.

Pending Measures of Legislation.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES (VOTING PAPERS).

A BILL TO AFFORD SHAREHOLDERS IN JOINT STOCK COMPANIES FACILITIES FOR VOTING BY MEANS OF VOTING PAPERS.

The following bill has been brought into the House of Commons by Mr. D. Griffiths:—

Whereas it is expedient that greater facilities should be afforded to shareholders in joint-stock companies for voting at public meetings of such companies: be it enacted by the Queen's most excellent majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

1. It shall be lawful for any shareholder in a joint-stock company, in lieu of voting in person or by proxy, to nominate any other duly qualified shareholder of the company to deliver for him at the poll a voting paper containing the vote or votes to which he may be entitled; and such nominated shareholder shall be duly authorised to deliver such voting paper at the poll.

Every such voting paper shall bear date after the meeting of the company at which the poll shall have been demanded, and shall contain the name or names of the shareholder or shareholders nominated under the hand of the shareholder so voting to deliver such voting paper at the poll (or if the shareholder be a corporation, then under their common seal), and shall be according to the form or to the effect prescribed in the schedule to this Act annexed; and every such voting paper so delivered as aforesaid at the poll shall be received by the proper officers as containing the vote or votes given by the shareholders so voting: provided always, that such officers may require proper proof that the person delivering the voting paper be a duly qualified shareholder in the company.

2. When a poll shall have been demanded at any public meeting of a company, the meeting shall be adjourned for such time, not less than seven nor more than fourteen days, as the meeting shall determine, for the purpose of declaring the poll; and the secretary of the company shall deliver or send by post to every shareholder of the company a circular, stating every motion and amendment upon which the poll is demanded, and the names of the movers and seconders thereof, and the day to which the meeting is adjourned, and no more, addressed to the shareholder at his registered address, and sent by post to or delivered at the address, not less than six days before the day for holding the adjourned meeting, during which days the poll shall be kept open, enclosing a blank unstamped voting paper, with proper instructions for the use of the same; and the funds of the company shall not be used for stamping any voting paper, unless the meeting so determine, in which case a blank stamped voting paper shall be sent with the instructions.

3. Any person falsely or fraudulently signing any voting paper in the name of any other person, and every person tendering, transmitting, or delivering as genuine any false or falsified voting paper, knowing the same to be false or falsified, and any person with fraudulent intent altering, defacing, destroying, withholding, or abstracting any voting paper, and any person wilfully making a false answer to any question put to him by the returning or other officer, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and punishable by fine or imprisonment, for a term not exceeding three months.

4. A voting paper duly signed and delivered at the poll shall revoke a proxy paper previously given by a shareholder, and every proxy paper shall be accompanied by a notice that it may be so revoked.

5. After the passing of this Act the funds of the company shall not be used for stamping any proxy paper, unless a meeting of the company shall have so determined, in which case a blank stamped proxy paper shall be sent out, with the proper

instructions; nor shall the funds of the company be used for paying the stamp for the postage of any envelope sent out to frank the return of any proxy or voting paper, unless a meeting of the company shall so determine.

6. The directors of any joint stock company shall provide proper and suitable means for taking a division of the shareholders present at any public meeting of the company, and tellers shall be chosen by the shareholders for the purpose of counting the votes.

The doors of the room in which the votes are taken shall be locked previously to the taking the division, and any person, not being a duly qualified shareholder or an officer of the company, wilfully remaining in the room and voting in the division, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and punishable by fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding one month.

7. Every voting paper shall be liable to the same stamp duty as that which may now or at any time be imposed on a proxy paper, and the stamp required to be affixed to or impressed on a proxy or voting paper may be a draft and receipt stamp.

8. This Act shall be read and have effect as part of the Companies' Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845 (8 & 9 Vict. c. 16), and this Act may for all purposes be cited as "Companies' Voting Act, 1864."

PROVINCES.

BARNSTAPLE.—The return of Mr. Bremridge to Barnstaple, as the actual sitting member for the borough which he left a few days ago as a private gentleman, caused great excitement in the minds of the populace, which was in some degree shared by residents in Exeter. Mr. Bremridge arrived at Queen-street station, Exeter, about four o'clock on Tuesday afternoon, and was received by many gentlemen and tradesmen of the city, who cheered him heartily, the compliment being acknowledged by bows. Before Mr. Bremridge left the station for Barnstaple a crowd had collected, when cheers for him were given, followed by alternate cheers and groans for Earl Fortescue. Long before the train reached Barnstaple an immense crowd had collected at the station, and vociferous cheering and cordial greetings were given to the new member on his arrival. As soon as he entered the carriage which was in waiting, the horses were taken from it, and it was dragged to the Lion Hotel by about thirty men. From the balcony of that hotel Mr. Bremridge made a short speech to a noisy and enthusiastic crowd. He expressed his belief that he had had the support and sympathy of the voters and the people, and, having now been recognised as their member, he would endeavour to give them satisfaction in that capacity. The speech was loudly applauded.

SCOTLAND.

The Lord President of the Court of Session in Scotland and a jury were for ten days previously to the 15th inst. engaged in the trial of a cause arising out of the failure of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Bank. Mr. Cullen, a shareholder in that bank, brought an action against Sir William Johnston, the chairman of the board of directors, the trustees of the late Mr. Thompson, who was for some years manager, Mr. Kirk, who was first secretary and then both secretary and manager, suing them for the value of the shares which he alleged he bought on the faith of the reports they issued as to the state of the bank, and more particularly one report of a committee of the directors which had been appointed to investigate the state of the bank's affairs. The leading counsel at the Scotch bar were engaged in the cause; and the parties to the cause, as well as several of the other directors, were examined and cross-examined at great length. On the 15th inst. the Lord President summed up, after which the jury retired, but were unable to agree to an unanimous verdict. After being locked up for three hours they might have returned a verdict of three-fourths of their number, but even this amount of unanimity was not forthcoming, and, after being locked up for three hours longer, they were discharged.

A case of breach of promise, *James McIlhenny v. Mary Campbell* was heard in the Sheriff's Small Debt Court, Glasgow, on the 14th inst. The following is a copy of the summons served upon the defender:—"1864, April 1.—To loss and damage sustained, and to be sustained, and as a solatium for the injury to the feelings and

reputation to the said James M'Ilhanny, by and in consequence of the said Mary Campbell having failed, of this date, to enter into matrimony with the said James M'Ilhanny, in terms of promise and engagement to do so, and especially after proclamation of banns had taken place, and arrangements made for the marriage to take place of the 1st of April, the said Mary Campbell having unwarrantably and without cause refused to contract said marriage. Damages £20. To the value of the following, supplied by the said James M'Ilhanny to Mary Campbell, in contemplation of said marriage, viz.:—'For a green coburg dress and petticoat, £1 8s. 5½d.; a bonnet, 6d.; to cash advanced to relieve a petticoat belonging to Campbell, which had been pledged, 4s.; £21 8s. 5½d.; restricted to £12.' While the sheriff was reading the summons, the audience indulged in a titter, the pursuer being a man apparently between fifty and sixty years of age, and the defender a girl of fifteen. The Sheriff (to defender)—What do you say to this? The girl did not speak, but her father handed in a document which certified that his daughter was only fifteen years of age. The Sheriff (to pursuer)—Did you get her father's consent? The Father—No; I never was spoken to. Pursuer—Sure, yer honour, I got the mother's consent (laughter). The Sheriff—But did you get the father's consent?—if not, I must dismiss the case. Pursuer—I got her mother's consent. The Sheriff—You had no right to enter into a contract of this kind with a minor without the consent of her guardians. I therefore assize the defender. The pursuer and defender then left the court amidst the laughter of the audience.

IRELAND.

On the first day of Easter Term, the Lord Chief Justice, the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, and the Lord Chief Baron, held levees at their houses of members of the Bar, and, afterwards, their lordships and the puisne judges and members of the Bar attended the levee of the Lord Chancellor at his house, Upper Pembroke-street. But the hall of the Four Courts was the chief point of attraction. It was crowded at an early hour by a numerous and fashionable assembly of ladies and gentlemen, to witness the levee in the hall. A broad matting was laid down from the grand entrance on the river to the statue of Plunket, on the other side, and the Lord Chancellor, having passed up, attended by his secretary, purse-bearer, and train-bearer, took his place at the head. The other judges, masters, and law officers, except the Attorney-General, who is absent in Parliament, serjeants, &c., passed along in successive order, and, having made their obeisance to his Lordship, fell into line, right and left, according to the order of precedence. The appearance of the venerable Chief Justice, now close on his ninetieth year, as he walked slowly but with a firm step up the line, created much interest, as also that of Judge Ball, who is also much advanced in life, and who walked with a quicker, though unsteady step, than the Chief of the Queen's Bench. The levee being over, the judges and benchers met in chamber, and elected Mr. Haverty, the Irish historian, as assistant librarian to the King's Inns Library—an appointment which has given general satisfaction. They afterwards opened their respective courts, and proceeded with the ordinary business.

At a meeting of the members of the Incorporated Society of Attorneys and Solicitors, on the 15th inst., Mr. John Goddard, son of the late respected president of the society, was appointed secretary, in the room of Mr. Edward Iles, deceased.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

THE METROPOLITAN AND PROVINCIAL LAW ASSOCIATION.

This society held its seventeenth annual general meeting at the Incorporated Law Society's Hall, on Wednesday last, Mr. W. Shaen in the chair, when the following resolutions were passed:—

1. On the motion of the chairman, That the report of the committee of management be adopted, and that it be printed and circulated in the usual way.
2. On the motion of Mr. C. A. Smith, of Greenwich, seconded by Mr. Edwin Hedger, That the cordial thanks of the association be presented to the committee of management for their labours during the past year.

3. On the motion of Mr. H. J. Francis, seconded by Mr. A. Hart, of Dorking,

That the following members of the association be elected chairman, deputy chairmen, and members of the committee of management for the ensuing year:—

Chairman:—Mr. E. F. Burton.

Deputy-Chairmen:—Mr. G. W. Hodge, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and Mr. S. Williams.

Metropolitan Solicitors:—Mr. J. Anderton, Mr. E. S. Bailey, Mr. Keith Barnes, Mr. J. Beaumont, Mr. William Bell, Mr. E. Benham, Mr. George Bower, Mr. T. Holmes Bower, Mr. J. Bridges, Mr. E. Bromley, Mr. James Burchell, Mr. E. F. Burton, Mr. Henry C. Chilton, Mr. J. M. Clabon, Mr. W. S. Cookson, Mr. W. Crossman, Mr. Charles Druce, Mr. E. W. Field, Mr. A. Hemsley, Mr. Jno. Hopgood, Mr. T. Kennedy, Mr. Edward Lawrance, Mr. C. E. Lewis, Mr. C. H. Lovell, Mr. J. A. Rose, Mr. W. Shaen, M.A., Mr. J. S. Torr, Mr. C. R. Williams, Mr. S. Williams, Mr. John Young.

Provincial Solicitors:—Mr. E. T. Payne, Bath; Mr. T. F. Champney, Beverley; Mr. Arthur Ryland, Mr. J. Rawlins, Mr. J. W. Whateley, Birmingham; Mr. J. Rayner, Bradford; Mr. H. Verrall, Mr. W. J. Williams, Brighton; Mr. A. Cox, Mr. L. Fry, Mr. H. S. Wasbrough, Bristol; Mr. J. Greene, Bury St. Edmunds; Mr. T. Wilkinson, Mr. H. T. Sankey, Canterbury; Mr. John Nanson, Carlisle; Mr. T. Coombs, Dorchester; Mr. Herbert New, Evesham; Mr. R. T. Brookman, Folkestone; Mr. John Burrup, Gloucester; Mr. William Henry Moss, Mr. R. Wells, Hull; Mr. S. B. Jackman, Ipswich; Mr. H. Sanders, Kidderminster; Mr. John Sharp, Lancaster; Mr. A. S. Field, Leamington; Mr. Robert Barr, Mr. John Bulmer, Mr. Edwin Eddison, Mr. J. H. Shaw, Leeds; Mr. T. Ingram, Mr. S. Stone, Mr. G. Toller, Leicester; Mr. T. Avison, Mr. E. Banner, Mr. M. D. Lowndes, Mr. R. A. Payne, Mr. W. Radcliffe, Mr. J. J. Ridley, Mr. Jas. O. Watson, Liverpool; Mr. J. W. Danby, Lincoln; Mr. J. Case, Maidstone; Mr. J. P. Aston, Mr. J. F. Beaver, Mr. J. Crossley, Mr. S. Heelis, Mr. J. Janion, Mr. W. H. Partington, Mr. James Street, Mr. G. Thorley, Manchester; Mr. John Clayton, Mr. Wm. Crighton, Mr. R. R. Dees, Mr. G. W. Hodge, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Mr. T. Scriven, Northampton; Mr. W. Foster, Bart., Mr. William Skipper, Norwich; Mr. R. Enfield, Mr. W. Hunt, Nottingham; Mr. E. Ball, Pershore; Mr. E. J. Pickelley, Rhayader; Mr. Joseph Pears, Ruthin; Mr. E. P. Kelsey, Salisbury; Mr. J. Broughall, Shrewsbury; Mr. T. Brown, Skipton; Mr. C. E. Deacon, Southampton; Mr. A. J. Moore, Sunderland; Mr. E. J. Hayes, Mr. T. M. Whitehouse, Wolverhampton; Mr. C. Pidcock, Mr. J. Stallard, Worcester; Mr. W. Beaumont, Warrington; Mr. T. Waters, Winchester; Mr. John Lewis, Wrexham; Mr. Thomas Hodgson, Mr. George Leeman, Mr. G. H. Seymour, York.

4. On the motion of Mr. Street, of Manchester, seconded by Mr. Stephen Williams,

That the best thanks of the association be presented to Mr. C. A. Smith, and Mr. J. Morris, for their services as auditors, and that they be requested to accept the same office for the ensuing year.

5. On the motion of Mr. Avison, of Liverpool, seconded by Mr. C. A. Smith,

That the best thanks of the Association be presented to the council of the Incorporated Law Society, for the cordial co-operation they have afforded to the committee of management during the past year, and for their courtesy in lending one of their rooms for the purposes of the meeting.

6. On the motion of Mr. J. S. Torr, seconded by Mr. Case, of Maidstone,

That the best thanks of this meeting be presented to Mr. W. Shaen for his services during the past year, and for his able conduct in the chair this day.

THE SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

The twelfth half-yearly general meeting of the members and friends of the above association, established for the purpose of granting relief to poor and necessitous attorneys, solicitors, and proctors throughout England and Wales, and their wives, widows, and families, was held on Wednesday last at the Law Institution, London, for the purpose of receiving the report and statement of accounts for the past half-year. Amongst other gentlemen present were T. Harrison, Esq., W. Shaen, S. Williams, C. A. Smith, E. Hedger, J. S. Torr, A. Hart, J. Case (Maidstone), J. Street (Manchester), T. Avison (Liverpool), P. Rickman, J. Pilcher, S. Smith, T. F. Peacock, W. C. Hall, A. R. Bristow (Solicitor of the Admiralty), G. J. Braikenridge, M. K. Braund, E. J. Filder, R. H. Giraud, &c. The chair was occupied by T. Harrison, Esq.

The Secretary, Mr. EIFFE, having read the notice convening the meeting, and the minutes of the previous half-yearly meeting, which were confirmed, proceeded to read the report and statement of receipts and expenditure. The report stated that the association had received an accession during the last half-year of fifteen life and ninety-nine annual members, increasing the aggregate number of members to 1,440, of whom 507 are life and 933 annual. There are sixteen life members who also contribute annually to the funds of the association. The accounts showed the total receipts during the same period to have been—inclusive of a balance of £156 carried to the new account—£1,050 5s. 8d. Assistance had been granted to the widows of two deceased members, and a sum of £35 had been distributed amongst the distressed families of non-members. £400 had been added to their invested capital by the purchase of India Five per Cent. Stock, so that the stock of the association now stands, in Three per Cent. Consols, £4,680 10s. 8d.; and in Five per Cent. India Stock, £3,411 7s.; making a total of £8,091 17s. 8d.; producing in annual dividends the sum of £300, which forms the extent of the society's present annual relief fund.

The CHAIRMAN, in moving the adoption of the report, thought they might congratulate themselves upon the progress they had made. They had been in existence six years, and their funded property had reached £8,091 17s. 8d.

The report and balance-sheet were unanimously adopted.

A cordial vote of thanks was accorded to James Anderton, Esq., for having for so long a period given the free use of rooms in New Bridge-street to the association.

W. C. HALL, Esq., then rose, in accordance with previous notice, to move, "That a moiety of the society's income arising from its invested capital be applied in the formation of annuities of £30 each, for the benefit of necessitous members of the association, or their widows, the candidates for such annuities to be approved of by the directors, but to be elected by the members at large." Looking at the results after six years, he contended that they were unequal, and was of opinion that the fact of the funds being distributed by a few, and that the great bulk of subscribers exercised no voice in the disposal of their funds, was the primary cause of such small results. He believed the adoption of his resolution would prove the prelude to a very great accession of subscribers, and increase in their funds.

G. J. BRAKENRIDGE, Esq., briefly seconded the resolution.

W. SHAEN, Esq., felt bound to oppose the resolution. He believed those who brought it forward were actuated by a sincere desire to help forward the association, but he did not think it would achieve the desired end. If, like other societies, they made the granting of relief dependent upon the number of votes obtained, they caused the expenditure of a large sum of money for cabs, printing, &c., which might be better employed, as well as wasting the time of candidates and compelling them to recapitulate their distresses to a number of persons, which must be very hurtful to the feelings of the candidate. He hoped the resolution would be negatived.

After some further discussion the motion was put and lost, the numbers being—for the motion, 4; against it, 9.

The usual votes of thanks to the directors, to the Incorporated Law Society, the chairman, and to the secretary for his very efficient services, closed the proceedings.

ADMISSION OF ATTORNEYS.

NOTICES OF ADMISSION.

In and on the last day of Easter Term, 1864.

(The clerks' names appear in small capitals, and the attorneys to whom articulated or assigned follow in ordinary type.)

BASTARD, EDWARD.—Richard Bastard, Philpot-lane.

DALSTON, HENRY MAXWELL.—J. N. Dalston, 161, Piccadilly.

DANIELL, JOHN RULE.—S. T. G. Downing, Redruth, Cornwall.

ELKINS, FREDERICK.—Louis Innes Baker, Guildford; Jos. Hockley, Guildford; Wm. B. Young, Hastings.

EDS, HENRY HUTCHINGS.—T. E. Parsons, Gracechurch-street.

GIBBS, MACLAUGHLAN ROBERT.—R. T. Head, Exeter; N. Gedye, Chatham-place, City.

MASON, JOHN.—Robert Bendle, Carlisle.

MILES, ARCHIBALD JOHN.—D. H. Serrell, South-square, Gray's-inn; M. K. Braund, Furnival's-inn.

MURROW, CHARLES.—James Murrow, jun., Liverpool; Richard C. Brown, Liverpool.

PROCTOR, WILLIAM, jun.—George Moor, Durham; Robert Stafford, Durham.

SUMNER, EDMUND.—George Fielder, Godliman-street.

WHITELOCK, ROBERT WILLIAM.—William Paitson, Whitehaven.

On the last day of Easter Term, 1864.

BEST, WILLIAM.—James Ralfe, Winchester.

BIGGENDEN, JOHN PATTENDEN.—Jno. Biggenden, 5, Walbrook, London; Thomas E. Tomlins, 9, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

BOWERS, BARCLAY GEORGE.—Benjamin W. Rawlings, 7, John-street, Bedford-row; Romford, Essex; 16, Furnival's-inn; Barclay F. Watson, 36, Lincoln's-inn-fields; and 1, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

CARTHEW, THOMAS.—Henry Heffill, Disa, Norfolk.

CLARKE, CHARLES GUYON.—Henry Vallance, 20, Essex-street, Strand.

CUDLIFF, RALPH BROOKING.—Christopher V. Bridgman, Tavistock.

HANDLEY, JAMES.—Richard H. Munday, 24, late 12, Horbury-crescent, and 6, Essex-street, Strand.

HINCHCLIFF, EDWIN.—Isaac Sewell, Gresham House, Old Broad-street.

JONES, WILLIAM.—William Hughes, Conway.

LEACH, RICHARD HOWELL WALKER.—Francis Leach, 10, Lancaster-place, Strand.

LEE, SAMUEL (B.A.).—John Lee, Whitechurch, Salop.

LOMAX, JOHN.—Henry Wheeler, Manchester; Henry Howe, 45, Victoria-street, Westminster.

MORGAN, WILLIAM HENRY.—Sydney Alleyne, Tonbridge.

PARKIN, PAXTON WILLIAM.—Henry T. Johns, Ringwood.

RIDSDALE, FRANCIS JAMES, jun.—Francis James Ridsdale, Gray's-inn-square, Middlesex.

SEDGWICK, ISAAC.—Edward Sidebottom, Hull.

SPENCER, GEORGE WAKEFIELD.—William Spencer, Birmingham.

STEPHENSON, JOHN BOYES.—Appleton Stephenson, Whithy, York.

VOSPER, ALFRED SAMUEL MOON.—Charles Willeford, Tavistock.

WILDING, THOMAS.—John S. W. Herring, 17, Stafford-street, Marylebone.

WILLOBY, WILLIAM.—Edward Willoby, Berwick-upon-Tweed.

WOODHOUSE, DANIEL THOMAS.—James Joseph Blake, 39, King William-street, City.

APPLICATION TO BE ADMITTED AS A SOLICITOR OF THE HIGH COURT OF CHANCERY.

In Trinity Term, 1864, pursuant to 20 & 21 Vict. c. 77, s. 44.

DEACON, WILLIAM COPE.—Robert Edward Pownall, Doctors-commons.

APPLICATIONS FOR RE-ADMISSION.

Last day of Trinity Term, 1864.

Cross, William Henry Wright, County Gaol, Taunton; and House of Correction, Cold-Bath-fields.

Oldknow, Samuel, 12, Arundel-square, Barnsbury; 10, Ellington-street, Barnsbury; and 16, Euston-road.

APPLICATIONS TO TAKE OUT OR RENEW ATTORNEYS' CERTIFICATES.

May 10, 1864.

Biddles, John Henry, 7, Victoria-terrace, Notting-hill; and 30, Sussex-road, Holloway.

Boggie, John, 14, Olive-street and Almond-street, Liverpool.

Bruton, Charles, 13, Walbrook, London; and Exeter.

Clifton, George Henry, Constantinople; and Candilli, Asia Minor.

Cotton, John Lucas, Tynemouth.

Gibbs, Griffith, Swansea, Glamorgan.

Griffith, Joseph Crane, Liverpool.

Harvey, Thomas, 4, Campden-hill-road, Kensington; Church-road, De Beauvoir-square.

Harvey, William Phillips, 19, George-street, Euston-square.

Jones, Henry Lloyd, Bangor, Carnarvon.

Montgomery, John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Parsons, Henry, Douglas, Isle of Man.

Roumieu, Edward Abraham, Bridge-road, St. John's-wood; 8, Regent square, St. Pancras; and Barnet, Herts.

Scott, Edward, 24, Osborne-terrace, Clapham-road.

Smith, Frederick, Doncaster, York.

Street, Thomas Leach, 6, Cumming-street, Pentonville.

Swann, John, Wickham, Hants; and 15, Featherstone-buildings.

Waldron, Alfred, Brentwood, Essex.

Waring, Henry, Cavendish, Suffolk; and Swansea, Glamorgan.

White, Henry Brown, Warrington, Lancaster.
White, Walter, Erskine-chambers, 36, Lincoln's-inn-fields; and
62, Winchester-st, Pimlico.
Wood, Walter, 78, Guildford-street, Middlesex.

COURT PAPERS.

ORDER IN CHANCERY.

8th April, 1864.

Whereas, by the 5th of the Consolidated Orders of this court, rule 6, it is provided that "the Lord Chancellor may, from time to time, by special order, direct the offices to be closed on days other than those mentioned in the 1st rule of the said Order;" and whereas, Tuesday, the 24th day of May next, has been appointed for the celebration of the anniversary of her Majesty's birthday, and such event has been heretofore observed as a general holiday in the several offices of this court, his Lordship doth therefore order that the several offices of this court be closed on Tuesday, the 24th day of May next, and that this order be entered and set up in the several offices of this Court.

(Signed) WESTBURY, C.

Exchequer Chamber.

SITTINGS IN ERROR.

The following days have been appointed for the argument of errors and appeals:—

QUEEN'S BENCH.			
Tuesday	May 10	Wednesday	May 11
COMMON PLEAS.			
Thursday	May 12	Friday	May 13
EXCHEQUER.			
Saturday	May 14	Monday	May 16

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

MEETINGS.

DEMERARA RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 20th inst., a dividend at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

SOUTH LEICESTERSHIRE RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 20th inst., a dividend at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

BILLS IN PARLIAMENT.

The following bills for the formation of new lines of railway have been read a third time and passed in the House of Commons:—

HALIFAX AND OVENDEN JUNCTION.
NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME.
SALISBURY AND YEOVIL.

PROJECTED COMPANIES.

THE CONTINENTAL UNION GAS COMPANY (LIMITED).

Capital, £400,000, in 20,000 shares of £20 each.
Solicitors—Messrs. Hughes, Masterman, & Hughes, 17, Bucklersbury.

This company has been formed for the purpose of carrying on the business of gas works now in full operation, with exclusive privileges, in the following cities and towns of France and Italy, viz.:—Strasbourg, Cette, Nismes, Vienne, Roanne, Beaucuire Rueil, Albi, Milan, Genoa, Parma, Modena, and Alessandria, and which now belong to the Société Union des Gaz. The company will also have the power of extending the existing works, and of adopting such other concessions as may be considered sufficiently remunerative, either alone or in connection with the Société Union des Gaz.

ALLIANCE SHIP-OWNING AND SHIP-BUILDING COMPANY (LIMITED).

Introduced by the London Financial Association (Limited).
Capital, £600,000, in 20,000 shares of £30 each.
Solicitors—Messrs. Fyson, Tatham, Curling, & Walls, Frederick's-place, Old Jewry.

The objects of this company are the union in one interest of the building of ships; their maintenance in efficient condition; and their employment on a well-organised and regularly-conducted system, the advantages of which over the isolated transactions of individuals can scarcely be over-estimated.

It is arranged that the ships possessed by the firm of Thomas & William Smith, employed in the Indian and Eastern trades, together with the London shipping establishment of that firm, should be transferred to the company. The goodwill to be paid to the firm is to be entirely in paid-up shares.

It is also arranged that the freehold dockyard at Limehouse, on the banks of the Thames, the property of Messrs. Young, Son, & Magnay, shall be purchased by the company, with the plant, fixtures, utensils, and stock-in-trade. The sum to be paid to this firm for goodwill is also to be taken entirely in paid-up shares.

COMMERCIAL FINANCE AND AGENCY COMPANY (LIMITED).

Capital, £250,000, in 10,000 shares of £25 each.

Solicitors—Messrs. Wilkins & Blyth, 10, St. Swithin's-lane.

This company is formed on the principle of the Commercial Institute, by which capitalists, and investors generally, are enabled to take a dormant interest in commercial undertakings on the joint-stock limited principle, the society acting as agents, and in some cases providing a portion of the required capital.

The company will also be prepared to render assistance to existing joint-stock enterprises, which, although possessing all the elements of success, and having the greater part of their capital subscribed, are frequently unable to commence operations in consequence of a small balance of shares still requiring to be placed, and arrangements can in such cases be made to render the needful aid in a manner combining considerable profit with ample security.

It is not intended to compete with the great financial companies, but operations equally lucrative will be carried out, with the additional advantage of having a considerable amount of profitable business to commence operations with.

WORTHING ROYAL SEA HOUSE HOTEL COMPANY (LIMITED).

Capital £30,000, in 6,000 shares of £5 each.

Solicitors—Messrs. Lepard & Gammon, 9, Cloak-lane, London; Wm. Hugh Dennett, Esq., Bedford-row, Worthing.

The company is projected for the purpose of purchasing and carrying on the business of the Royal Sea House Hotel at Worthing.

THE PERNAMBUCO IMPROVEMENTS COMPANY (LIMITED).

(City of Recife, in Brazil.)

Capital £200,000, in 10,000 shares of £20 each.

Solicitors—Messrs. Flux & Argles, Mincing-lane.

This company is formed for the purpose of carrying out the works of improvement and drainage in the city of Recife, under a concession granted with exclusive privileges by the Brazilian Government.

THE EAST INDIA FINANCIAL ASSOCIATION (LIMITED).

Capital £1,000,000, in £20,000 shares of £50 each.

Solicitors—Messrs. Upton, Johnson, & Upton, 20, Austin-friars, London.

The objects of the Association are strictly financial, and will be confined to India and the East.

The Association will grant loans secured by mortgages of land in the country, in cases where the security is undoubted, and on house property in the large towns; will make advances to the local governments for carrying on public works, and to builders and contractors, and generally upon approved securities, not coming within the limits of banking business.

The association will also negotiate the sale and purchase of landed, house, and other property on commission.

THE ENGLISH AND FOREIGN CREDIT COMPANY (LIMITED).

Capital, £2,000,000, in 40,000 shares of £50 each.

Solicitors—Messrs. Desborough, Young, & Desborough, 9, Sise-lane; Messrs. Swift & Co., 32, Great George-street, Westminster.

The general objects of this company are the same as those of other companies of a kindred nature which have been lately started in this country, and which, by the judicious employment of capital, have been enabled to secure for the shareholder such large dividends.

The Company will negotiate:—

1. Loans and concessions for railways, and other public works, abroad.
2. They will advance money on approved securities, as well as purchase and negotiate the same upon commission.

3. They will lend money to contractors of position and responsibility, and facilitate the construction of important public works.

THE CLARENCE HOTEL COMPANY (DOVER) (LIMITED).

Capital £75,000 in 7,500 shares of £10 each.

Solicitors—Messrs. Monckton & Monckton, 1, Raymond-buildings, Gray's-inn.

This company is now erecting a first-class family hotel upon the extensive freehold grounds of more than an acre in extent, formerly belonging to Clarence House, the purchase of which has recently been completed by the directors.

THE PALACE AND BURLINGTON HOTELS COMPANY (LIMITED).

Capital, £120,000, in 6,000 shares of £20 each.

Solicitors—Messrs. Few & Co., 2, Henrietta-street, Covent-garden, London.

This company has been formed for the purpose of purchasing the interest of Mr. J. G. Breach in the Palace Hotel, at Buckingham Gate, and the Burlington Hotel, in Cork-street, both at present under his management. A provisional arrangement has been entered into with him for that purpose, and no promotion money whatever has been or will be paid.

THE JOINT-STOCK COMPANIES' ASSOCIATION (LIMITED).

Capital, £50,000, in 10,000 shares of £5 each.

Solicitors—Messrs. Carritt & Son, 24, Basinghall-street, E.C.

This association proposes to organise and bring, or assist in the organisation and bringing, before the public *bona fide* joint-stock companies; receiving a reasonable commission for the same. It will, however, carefully abstain from introducing, or aiding in the introduction, of schemes which appear doubtful as safe and profitable investments for the shareholders.

THE INDEPENDENT FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY (LIMITED).

Capital, £1,000,000, in 40,000 shares of £25 each.

Solicitors—Messrs. Bennett & Stark, 4, Furnival's-inn, Holborn.

This company has for its purpose the transaction of the important and remunerative business of fire insurance, and that only, to the exclusion of other branches of business not unusually associated with it, under the same direction, and operating on one and the same capital.

THE BRITISH SLATE COMPANY (LIMITED).

Capital, £100,000, in £10,000 shares of £10 each.

Solicitors—Henry C. Elliott, Esq., 5, Sherborne-lane, King William-street, E.C.; Messrs. Avison & Boulton, 18, Cork-street, Liverpool.

The object of this company is to work valuable and extensive slate quarries in North and South Wales.

On Sunday last, being the first Sunday in Easter Term, the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor, the sheriffs, and undersheriffs, several of the City officers, aldermen, and members of the Common Council, met her Majesty's judges at divine service. The judges present were Mr. Justice Williams, Baron Channell, and Baron Martin.

The county electors of England and Wales on the register for the present year are 535,788 in number; fourteen years ago the number was not 500,000. The borough electors for the present year are 487,603; fourteen years ago they were not 400,000.

In the session of 1863 the House of Commons took fees on private bills to the amount of £66,614. The House took £1,325 in fees on the bill for a Beckenham, Lewes, and Brighton railway, and did not pass the bill after all.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTH.

MACKONOCHE—On April 16, at 5, Westbourne-terrace-road, the wife of James Mackonochie, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of a daughter.

DEATH.

JAMIESON—On April 16, at 23, Alva-street, Edinburgh, Andrew Jamieson, Esq., Solicitor Supreme Courts.

UNCLAIMED STOCK IN THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

The amount of Stock heretofore standing in the following Names will be transferred to the Parties claiming the same, unless other Claimants appear within Three Months:—

WESTWORTH, WILLIAM FREDERICK THOMAS VERNON, of Westworth Castle, Yorkshire, Esq., and SUSANNAH SMITH BAGWOLD, deceased, £185 11s. 7d. Consols.—Claimed by said W. F. T. V. Westworth.

LONDON GAZETTE.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

FRIDAY, April 15, 1864.

Wake, Chas S. & Wm Hy Farnfield, Attorneys and Solicitors, Crooked-lane, London (Wake & Farnfield). By mutual consent. Dec 31.

TUESDAY, April 19, 1864.

Harris, Joseph, & Richd Luck, Leicester, Attorneys-at-Law. Dec 31. By mutual consent.

Winding-up of Joint Stock Companies.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

FRIDAY, April 15, 1864.

Roman Bath Company (Limited).—The Master of the Rolls has appointed Joseph Bell, Jun, Cambridge, Builder, to be official liquidator of this company.

TUESDAY, April 19, 1864.

State Fire Insurance Company.—Vice-Chancellor Wood has peremptorily ordered a call of 12s. per share on all contributors of this company to be paid on or before May 2, to Wm Hy McCleight, Official Manager, 6, Raymond's-buildings, Gray's-inn.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, April 15, 1864.

Airey, Saml, Kendal, Beer-seller. July 16. Wilson, Kendal.

Aston, Thos, Guildford-st, Russell-sq, Esq. June 1. Booty & Butt, Gray's-inn.

Blamires, John, Bradford, Innkeeper. June 15. Wood & Killick, Bradford.

Brown, Henrietta Maria, Hartley Wintney, Hants, Spinster. May 12.

Phelps & Bennett, Red Lion-sq.

Coutate, John, Leeds, Tanner. July 1. Payne & Co, Leeds.

Druce, John, Southampton, Gent. May 19. Druce, Oxford.

Elwin, John, Bishop Auckland, Gent. May 13. Thornton, Bishop Auckland.

Horne, Thos, Grove-villas, Highbury, Coal Merchant. June 15. Rixon & Son, Cannon-st.

Johnson, John, Higher Broughton, nr Manch, Gent. June 20. Reed & Phelps, Gresham-st, and Sale & Co, Manch.

Kerr, Joseph, Olerton, Nottingham, Brewer's Agent. May 30. Hodding, Worksop.

Miller, John, Chalk Farm-rd, Camden-town, Baker. May 21. Le Blanc & Co, New Bridge-st, Blackfriars.

Reynardson, Jemima, Charles-st, Berkeley-sq, Spinster. June 1. Birch & Ingram, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Sookey, Eliz, Walsingham, Norfolk, Spinster. June 1. Canliffe & Beaumont, Chancery-lane.

Thompson, Eliz, York, Widow. June 15. Wilson, York.

Wheeler, Chas West, Millbrook, Southampton, M. D. July 22. Patterson & Brady, Southampton.

Wheeler, Hy Jas, Hyde-park-gardens, Esq. June 12. Wynne, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Wickenden, Wm, Blakeney, Gloucester, Clerk. May 16. Smith, Berkeley-st.

TUESDAY, April 19, 1864.

Austin, Maria, Wellington-st, Woolwich, Widow. May 31. Lettis, Bartlett's-buildings.

Benstead, Robt Hufton, Spalding, Lincoln, Glazier. July 7. Cammack, Spalding.

Burrell, Thos, Gt Marlow, Bucks, Blacksmith. June 1. Taylor & Jaquet, Finsbury-sq.

Esterbrook, Wm, Brownlow-st, Long-acre, Water Glider. May 31. Lettis, Bartlett's-bldgs.

Hebbron, Eliz, Potts-by-Swanby, Cleveland, Yorkshire, Widow. May 16. Chartres, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Ibell, Wm Wright, Brighton, Esq. June 14. Woods & Dempster, Brighton.

Maltby, Rev Hy Joseph, Eaglescliffe, Durham, Clerk. July 18. Upton & Co, Austin-friars.

Marshall, Rev Wm, Chickereil, Dorset, Clerk. June 15. Clarke & Co, Coleman-st.

Parker, Thos, Haydor, Lincoln, Stonemason. June 1. Thompson, Grantham.

Quickenden, Jonthn, Burstow, nr Reigate, Wood Dealer. June 1. Head & Son, East Grinstead.

Ridley, Joseph, Hexham, Northumberland, Glover. May 16. Chartres, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Rote, Robt, Bromsgrove, Baker. May 21. Sanders, Bromsgrove.

Warner, John, Bell Isle, Malden-lane, Middlx, Gent. June 24. Parker & Co, Bedford row.

Williams, Hy, Westminster, Bristol, Bacon Curer. May 31. Peters, Bristol.

Wilson, Thos, Alcester, Warwick, Gent. May 25. Palmer, Birm.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, April 15, 1864.

Baker, Wm, Oundle, Gent. May 21. Linton & Brudenell, M.R.

Bisson, Emma Susannah, Island of Alderney. May 11. Bisson & Addison, V.C. Wood.

Briscoe, Hugh Bennett, Stamford-leath, Chester, Yeoman. May 11. Frodsham & Kennerley, M.R.

Clark, John Flovman, Devonshire-st, Portland-pl, Victualler. May 3. Clark & Clark, V.C. Square.

Denny, Wm Dennis, Carlisle-lane, Lambeth, Letter Carrier. May 7. Denny & Keves, V.C. Kindersley.

Goldthorp, Benj, Ashton-under-Lyne, Timber Merchant. May 11. Bryson & Goldthorp, M.R.

Greaves, Horatio, Rhexfield, Horn Dealer. May 23. Myers & Greaves, M.R.

Nash, Chas Hy, Margaret-st, Limehouse, Grainer. May 2. Nash & Nash, V.C. Kindersley.

Neilson, Francis Robt, Westbourne-ter, Hyde-park, Esq. May 10. MacGregor & Temple, M.R.

TUESDAY, April 19, 1864.

Darnell, Thos, Blaby, Leicester, Baker. May 11. Greet & Darnell, V.C. Wood.
 Edwardes, Saml, Denbigh, Esq. May 10. Edwardes & Edwardes, V.C. Wood.
 Jones, Watkin, Streatham, Surrey, Esq. May 23. Price & Ord, M.R.
 Mair, Francis Hy, Gloucester-ter, Fimlico, Clerical Agent. May 4. Palz & Poole, V.C. Wood.
 Mitchell, John, Aspley, Huddersfield, Dyer. May 21. Shaw & Mitchell, V.C. Stuart.
 Nisbet, Frances Herbert, Cheltenham, Widow. May 11. Mends & Edalle, M.R.
 Pickett, John, Huistpierpoint, Sussex, Farmer. May 23. Wells & Pickett, M.R.
 Simpson, Hy, Newcastle-under-Lyne, Publican. May 21. Langley & Simpson, V.C. Stuart.

Assignments for Benefit of Creditors.

TUESDAY, April 19, 1864.

Colston, Wm, & Saml Colston, Westminster-bridge-rd, Woollen Drapers. March 23. Sole, Aldermanbury.

Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, April 15, 1864.

Adams, Chas, St Mary Axe, London, Victualler, & Alfred Moon, Grafton-st, Fitzroy-sq, Victualler. March 15. Comp. Reg April 13.
 Algar, Wm Everett, Bristol, Boot Maker. March 21. Conv. Reg April 13.
 Bailey, Joseph, Rainbow, nr Macclesfield, Silk Throwster. April 12. Comp. Reg April 14.
 Bean, Alex, Kingston-upon-Hull, Grocer. March 19. Conv. Reg April 15.
 Bedford, Thos, Stourbridge, Attorney and Solicitor. March 30. Conv. Reg April 13.
 Berry, Philip, Oldham, Grocer. March 17. Conv. Reg April 13.
 Bickerton, Wm, Coventry, Victualler. April 11. Comp. Reg April 12.
 Bradley, Hy, Macclesfield, Silk Manufacturer. April 9. Comp. Reg April 14.
 Brown, Joseph, Sheffield, Britannia Metal Manufacturer. April 12. Comp. Reg April 14.
 Burrow, Vincent Joseph, Droitwich, Draper. March 21. Conv. Reg April 15.
 Chambers, Jas Alex, & Wm Walker, Nottingham, Stationers. March 21. Comp. Reg April 14.
 Coxon, Thos, Greatley, Nottingham, Farmer. April 5. Conv. Reg April 12.
 Cunliffe, John, Waterford, nr Manch, Woolstapler. March 26. Comp. Reg April 14.
 Etherington, Edwin, Wigmore-st, Cavendish-sq, Stationer. March 26. Comp. Reg April 12.
 Everson, Jas, Hoxone, Suffolk, Grocer. March 19. Asst. Reg April 12.
 Ewing, Adam Paul, & Edward Long, Beeston, nr Leeds, Manufacturers. March 15. Asst. Reg April 12.
 Felton, Thos, & Thos Owen, Bridgnorth, Worsted Spinners. March 19. Conv. Reg April 14.
 Fraser, Alex Bristow, Bristol, General Merchant. April 4. Comp. Reg April 14.
 Gernall, Thos, Farmer, Ribchester, Lancaster. March 16. Asst. Reg April 13.
 Gough, Wm, Portsea, Brewer. March 15. Conv. Reg April 12.
 Granville, Arthur, Whitebrook, Monmouth, Civil Engineer. April 4. Arr. Reg April 13.
 Hawgood, Thos Saml, Portsea, Victualler. April 7. Comp. Reg April 13.
 Holton, Jas Shirley, sen, & Jas Shirley Hodson, Jun, Printers, Portgalt-st, Lincoln's-inn-fields. April 4. Comp. Reg April 12.
 Holmden, Wm Isbell Batten, & Saml Nicholson Holmden, Birm, Metal Merchants. April 5. Comp. Reg April 14.
 Howe, John, Elizabeth-pl, Notting-hill. March 4. Conv. Reg April 14.
 Humphrey, Wm, Gillingham, Kent, Shipwright. March 23. Conv. Reg April 15.
 Hunt, John, Montague-pl, Bloomsbury, Boarding-house Keeper. April 7. Comp. Reg April 12.
 Hutcheson, Hy, Cambridge, Gun Maker. March 19. Conv. Reg April 12.
 Magner, John Fisking, Lansdown-rd, Dalston, Baker. April 12. Comp. Reg April 13.
 Mannion, Jas, Lpool, Leather Dealer. April 4. Conv. Reg April 13.
 Marshall, Andrew, Sunderland, Currier. March 16. Conv. Reg April 12.
 McLaughlin, John, Lpool, Timber Merchant. April 12. Inspectorship. Reg April 13.
 Midgley, Chas, Huddersfield, Woollen Merchant. April 1. Comp. Reg April 12.
 Miles, Jas, Lee, Kent, Grocer. April 5. Conv. Reg April 14.
 Milner, Robt, Bridgnorth, Salop, Skinner. March 19. Asst. Reg April 13.
 Norris, Nehemiah, Manch, Smallware Manufacturer. March 11. Asst. Reg April 7.
 Orpin, Fras Edwd, Faversham, Builder. March 22. Asst. Reg April 14.
 Pears, John, Waltham-on-the-Wolds, Leicester, Farmer. March 19. Conv. Reg April 14.
 Poyser, Joseph, & Wm Waterworth, Manch, Grocers. March 12. Asst. Reg April 9.
 Riddle, Frederic, Lansdown-rd, Hackney, Wadding Manufacturer. March 24. Comp. Reg April 12.
 Riley, Benl, Islington, Cheesemonger. March 22. Comp. Reg April 14.
 Robbins, Thos, Bath, Publican. March 15. Asst. Reg April 12.
 Robson, Geo, Sunderland, Grocer. March 22. Conv. Reg April 14.
 Rogers, Edwin, Leicester, Grocer. March 16. Conv. Reg April 11.
 Russell, Geo, Shaftesbury-crescent, Fimlico, Surgeon. March 14. Comp. Reg April 11.
 Saunders, Joseph Lambert, Wisbeach, Sack Contractor. March 31. Comp. Reg April 9.
 Shaw, Hy, Selby, York, Butcher. March 28. Conv. Reg April 15.
 Taylor, John, Mumps, Oldham, Lancaster, Grocer. March 17. Conv. Reg April 14.
 Taylor, Wm Edwd, Waverree, nr Lpool, Draper. March 21. Asst. Reg April 12.
 Wagnaffe, Thos Rogers, Tavistock, Granite Merchant. March 18. Conv. Reg April 12.
 Wood, Richd, Cheltenham, House Agent. March 18. Asst. Reg April 14.
 Wright, Harry, East Bergholt, Suffolk, Saddler. April 7. Conv. Reg April 15.
 Wright, John Gill, Chichester, Draper. March 19. Asst. Reg April 14.

TUESDAY, April 19, 1864.

Bailey, Chas Wm, Westbam, Kent, Draper. March 21. Asst. Reg April 13.
 Benbow, Clifton, Iver, Bucks, Corn Merchant. March 21. Comp. Reg April 16.
 Benson, Jas, Manch, Grate Manufacturer. March 18. Asst. Reg April 15.
 Bentley, John, & John Oldfield, Salford, Dyers. March 23. Conv. Reg April 19.
 Boucher, Baldwin, Cusop, Hereford, Miller. April 6. Comp. Reg April 16.
 Colston, Wm, & Saml Colston, Westminster-bridge-rd, Woollen Drapers. March 23. Asst. Reg April 18.
 Court, Robt, Lpool, Leather Dealer. March 18. Conv. Reg April 15.
 Edwards, David, Macclesfield, Silk Throwster. April 12. Comp. Reg April 18.
 Evans, Jas, Stockport, Milliner. March 31. Conv. Reg April 18.
 Field, Richd Finch, Gt Malvern, Baker. March 19. Conv. Reg April 15.
 Gard, Wm Gostrovick, Calstock, Cornwall, Gent. March 23. Comp. Reg April 16.
 Gardner, Wm, & Peter Gardner, Lpool, Timber Merchants. March 23. Comp. Reg April 18.
 Forder, Wm, Nottingham, Tailor. March 23. Conv. Reg April 15.
 Green, Thos Carter, Middlesbrough, York, Tailor. March 23. Conv. Reg April 18.
 Haigh, Thos, Lindley, nr Huddersfield, Innkeeper. April 12. Comp. Reg April 18.
 Holgate, Robt, Westgate, Bradford, Hair Dresser. April 2. Comp. Reg April 14.
 Jackson, Martha, Hulme, Manch, Provision Dealer. March 24. Asst. Reg April 18.
 Knowles, John, Southwell, Nottingham, Tailor. March 19. Conv. Reg April 15.
 Lawton, John, Manch, Machinist. April 14. Conv. Reg April 18.
 Lear, Jas Lewton, Bristol, Publican. April 11. Comp. Reg April 19.
 Lewis, Isaac, Haverfordwest, Draper. March 18. Conv. Reg April 15.
 Lewis, Walter, Ross, Hereford, Cabinet Maker. March 19. Conv. Reg April 15.
 Mead, Job, & Wm Spry Gard, Funderston-gdn, Bethnal-green-rd, Tin Plate Workers. March 22. Asst. Reg April 18.
 Oakes, Wm, & Joshua Oakes, Leicester, Spinners. April 7. Conv. Reg April 19.
 Philips, Jas, Cheltenham. March 17. Asst. Reg April 14.
 Ratliff, Edmund Septimus, Wolston, Warwick, Silk Throwster. April 13. Comp. Reg April 18.
 Rayment, Hy, Upper Sydenham, Fishmonger. April 9. Comp. Reg April 16.
 Reynolds, Chas, Crayford, Kent, Farmer. April 6. Asst. Reg April 18.
 Rix, Hy, Norwich, Brushmaker. March 25. Conv. Reg April 16.
 Steven, Jas, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Hatter. March 21. Conv. Reg April 15.
 Swan, Peter, Houlton, Devon, Draper. March 25. Conv. Reg April 18.
 Tarbottom, Wm, & Joshua Crabtree, Bradford, Machine Makers. March 18. Conv. Reg April 14.
 Tubbs, Geo, & Mary Ann Jerrome, Northwood, Isle of Wight, Wheelwrights. March 19. Asst. Reg April 16.
 Watchorn, Isaac, Nottingham, Surgeon. April 16. Comp. Reg April 19.
 Whitmore, Richd, Bressingham, Norfolk, Farmer. March 26. Asst. Reg April 19.
 Woodcock, John, Hamer Bottoms, Rochdale, Beer-seller. April 5. Conv. Reg April 18.

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, April 15, 1864.

To Surrender in London.

Abrahams, Benl, Norwich, Watch Maker. Pet April 11. April 26 at 2.
 Roche & Gover, Old Jewry.
 Blacklock, Robt, Cranmer-rd, Bristol, Clerk. Pet April 12. April 26 at 12.
 Nicholas & Clark, Cook's-st.
 Bowman, Chas, Wynnst-st, St John-st-rd, Jeweller. Pet April 11. April 26 at 1.
 Lewis & Sons, Wilmington-sq.
 Burgess, Stephen Wm, Upper George-st, Bryanston-sq, Postmaster. Pet April 7. April 26 at 1.
 Chappell, Connaught-ter.
 Buxton, Saml, Old Kent-rd, Coach Builder. Pet April 13. April 26 at 2.
 Cooke, New Broad-st.
 Cottrell, Danl Chas, Kenton-rd, Hackney, Oil and Colourman. Pet April 13. April 26 at 12.
 Orchard, John-st.
 Cusken, Geo, King-st East, Hammersmith, Butcher. Pet April 12. May 3 at 2.
 Fallows & Son, Carlton-chambers.
 Denne, John, Winslow, Bucks, Surgeon. Pet April 19. April 26 at 1.
 Pattison & Wigg, Clements-lane, and Powell & Co, Newport Pagnell.
 Farmer, Robt Graham, Willow-walk, Bermensley, Merchants' Clerk. Pet April 13. April 26 at 2.
 France, Falcon-st.
 Freeman, Thos, Spa-rd, Bermensley, Timber Merchant. Pet April 19. May 3 at 11.
 Wild & Barber, Ironmonger-lane.
 Fuller, Fredk, Waltham-green, Fulham, Bricklayer. Pet April 13. April 26 at 1.
 Marshall & Son, Hatton garden.
 Harris, Valentine Sayer, Lopus-st, Fimlico, Cheesemonger. Pet April 11. April 26 at 1.
 Venn, New Inn.
 Hobson, Wm, Lower Beeding, Sussex, Farmer. Pet April 19. April 26 at 1.
 Linklaters & Hackwood, Waltham.
 Hudson, Wm Friden, Stanley-st, Fimlico, Clerk. Pet April 11. April 26 at 2.
 Angell, Gridhall-yard.
 Kay, John Winfred, Windsor, Builder. Pet April 19. April 26 at 2.
 Ferrin, Lincoln's-inn fields.
 Lyon, Hy Phillip, Gloucester-st, Fimlico, House Agent. Pet April 11. April 26 at 12.
 Waller & Kirby, Duke-st, Adelphi.
 Parrett, Geo Bretnell, Acton-pl, Bagnidge Wells-rd, Coffee-house Keeper. Pet April 15. April 26 at 2.
 Holmes, Frenchchurch-st.
 Payne, John, Northampton, Victualler. Pet April 9. April 26 at 1.
 Clarke, Son, & Rawlings, Coleman-st.
 Price, Chas Wm, Clerkenwell-green, Glass Bender. Pet April 11. April 26 at 1.
 Dubois, Gresham-st.
 Radford, Joseph, New Weston-st, Bermensley, Leather Merchant. Pet Jan 28. April 26 at 12.
 Butler, Tooley-st.
 Rothschild, Chas, Old Cavendish-st, Wine Merchant. Pet April 11. April 26 at 11.
 Brandon, Essex-st.
 Shuckford, Joshua, Trafalgar-pl, Clapham, Builder. Pet April 7. April 26 at 12.
 Vennings & Co, Tokenhouse-yard.

Steadman, Wm, Crockenhill, Kent, Baker. Pet April 13. April 26 at 12.
Russell & Son, Queen-st.
Stokes, Wm, Brighton, Glover. Pet April 5. April 26 at 11. Tippetts &
Son, Sise-lane.
Taylor, Geo Corlandt Buller, Cavalry Barracks, Canterbury, Lieutenant.
Pet April 9. May 3 at 11. Waldron, Lamb's Conduit-st.
Washbourn, John, Hungerford, Corn Dealer. Pet April 12. April 26 at
2. Lott, Parliament-st.
Watson, Robt, Frederick-st, Gray's-Inn-rd, Wine Merchant. Pet April 9.
April 26 at 11. Godfrey, Gray's-Inn.
Wolfehn, Magnus Leon, Oxford-st, Umbreller Manufacturer. Pet April
11. April 30 at 12. Chandler, Bucklebury.
Wood, Thos, Great Tower-st, Victualler. Pet April 9. April 26 at 1.
Webb, Jury-st.

To Surrender in the Country.

Anthony, Hy, Bridlington Quay, York, Fishmonger. Pet April 9. Brid-
lington, April 29 at 10. Richardson, Bridlington.
Ashworth, Handel, Newton, nr Hyde, Chester, Machine Broker. Pet
April 11. Hyde, April 27 at 11. Howard, Stockport.
Barton, Robt, & Josiah Barton, Bradford, Stuff Manufacturers. Pet April
6. Leeds, April 28 at 11. Rawson & Co, Bradford, and Bond & Barwick,
Leeds.
Blacknall, Alfred, Chesterfield, Tailor. Pet April 9. Chesterfield, April
28 at 11. Busby, Chesterfield.
Browne, Wm, Stone, Stafford, Joiner. Pet April 1. Birm, May 2 at
12. Michael, London, and Reece & Harris, Birm.
Caswell, Thos, Birm, Pump Maker. Pet April 8 (for pan). Birm, May 3
at 10.
Clay, Thos, Asbury, Chester, Ribbon Manufacturer. Pet March 22.
Lpool, April 26 at 11. Redfern & Son, Leek, and Evans & Co, Lpool.
Docker, Wm, and Thos Onions, Birm, Belows Maker. Pet April 11.
Birm, May 2 at 12. Parry, Birm.
Dykes, John Marshall, Stourbridge, Hatter. Pet April 11. Birm, May
3 at 12. Southall & Nelson, Birm.
Elston, Geo, Crediton, Devon, Bootmaker. Pet April 7 (for pan). Exeter,
April 26 at 11. Flood, Exeter.
Ellerington, Jane, Stockton, Victualler. Pet April 12. Stockton-on-Tees,
April 28 at 11. Dodds & Trotter.
Firth, Abraham, Eiland, Halifax, Beer-seller. Pet April 12. Leeds, April
28 at 11. Bond & Barwick, Leeds.
Godard, Hy Sheldon, Stratton, Cornwall, Millwright. Pet April 12.
Holworthy, April 27 at 11. Rowe, Stratton.
Grimeshaw, Edw Jas, St Helen's, Lancaster, Surveyor. Pet April 13.
Lpool, April 28 at 11. Evans & Co, Lpool.
Hodgetta, Chas, Birm, Metal Worker. Pet April 12. Birm, May 3 at 10.
East, Birm.
Holme, Paul, Sheffield, Chemist. Pet April 13. Sheffield, April 28 at 1.
Binney & Son, Sheffield.
Iles, Geo, Charlton, Gloucester, Farmer. Adj. Bristol, April 29 at 12.
Jenson, Wm, Gunning, Leicester, Tailor. Pet April 11. Market Har-
borough, April 26 at 11. Rawlins, Market Harborough.
Jones, Thos, Wrickton, nr Bridgnorth, Farm Servant. Pet April 7.
Clebury Mortimer, April 26 at 12. Burbury, Bewdley.
Leigh, Hy, Ashton-under-Lyne, Commission Agent. Pet April 12. Ash-
ton-under-Lyne, April 28 at 12. Andrew, Manch.
Loretti, Wm, Birm, Flag Dealer. Pet April 8 (for pan). Birm, May 3
at 10.
Marks, Wm, West Leyes, Rugby, Corn Dealer. Pet April 13. Rugby,
May 3 at 11. Smallbone, Coventry.
Markes, David, Birm, Boot Manufacturer. Pet April 12. Birm, May 2
at 12. East, Birm.
Moore, John, Tiverton, Butcher. Pet April 6. Exeter, April 26 at 11.
Flood, Exeter.
Moorhouse, Wm Hy, Kingston-upon-Hull, Victualler. Pet April 9.
Kingston-upon-Hull, April 27 at 11. Summers, Hull.
Oldham, Alex, and Geo Andrew, Newton Moor, Chester, Engineers. Pet
April 13. Hyde, April 27 at 12. Heddlah, Manch.
Parminster, Geo Hy, Heaviree, Devon, Clerk. Pet April 9. Exeter, April
27 at 11. Friend, Exeter.
Paugler, John, Marsh Chapel, Lincoln, Grocer. Pet April 11. Leeds,
April 27 at 12. Spurr, Hull.
Peet, Hy, Bristol, Newsvendor. Pet April 11. Bristol, April 29 at 12.
Hull.
Phillips, Chas, Wolverhampton, Tinplate Worker. Pet April 7. Wolver-
hampton, May 9 at 12. Thurstons, Wolverhampton.
Pudsey, Seth, Gate Fulford, York, Farmer. Pet April 9. York, April 27
at 11. Grayston, York.
Ricketts, John, Everton, Lancaster, Builder. Pet April 12. Lpool, April
28 at 11. Harris, Lpool.
Sands, Wm, Birkenhead, Builder. Adj April 11. Lpool, April 28 at 11.
Scamp, Robt, Bristol, Builder. Pet April 11. Bristol, April 29 at 12.
Dix.
Sharpley, Joseph, Macclesfield, Warehouseman. Pet April 11. Manch,
April 28 at 12. Hugginsbotham & Barclay, Macclesfield.
Swaine, Joseph, Macclesfield, Tailor. Pet April 13. Manch, April 27 at
12. Farrot & Co, Macclesfield.
Titterton, Chas Richd, Birm, Colour Manufacturer. Pet April 14. Birm,
May 6 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.
Trepess, Francis, Warwick, Surveyor. Pet April 13. Birm, May 2 at 12.
Newnam & Chadwick, Warwick, and James & Griffin, Birm.
Trigge, Chas John, Sherburn, York, Schoolmaster. Pet April 14. Leeds,
April 28 at 11. Clarke & Perkins, York, and Caras & Tempest, Leeds.
Trump, Thos Edw, Exeter, Bootmaker. Pet April 13. Exeter,
April 26 at 11. Flood, Exeter.
Webb, Felix, Shedley, Warwick, Needle Maker. Pet April 12 (for pan).
Birm, May 6 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.
Woodcock, Chas, Bradford, Railway Porter. Pet April 12. Bradford,
May 3 at 10. Watson, Bradford.
Yale, John Carlisle Duncan, Bradford, Clerk. Pet April 13. Exeter,
April 27 at 12.30. Laidman & Tremewen, Exeter.

TUESDAY, April 19, 1864.

To Surrender in London.

Aley, Robt Timothy Thos, Warwick-pl, Kensington, Baker. Pet April 16.
May 3 at 12. Hill, Basinghall-st.
Baker, Alfred, Brunswick-st, Hackney-rd, Bonnet Shape Maker. Pet
April 12. May 3 at 2. Marshall, Hatton-garden.

Brisley, Chas, Grove-st, Hackney, Cabinet Maker. Pet April 13. May 3
at 11. Marshall & Son, Hatton-garden.
Bristow, Edwd, Landport, Portsea, Mercantile Clerk. Pet April 15.
May 3 at 11. Jones, New-Inn, for Faffard, Portsea.
Gale, Gloucester, Winchester-st, Mimico, Comm Traveller. Pet April 15.
May 3 at 12. Munday, Essex-st.
Greator, Hy, Danvers-st, Chelsea, Zinc Worker. Pet April 15. May
3 at 12. Batley, Bucklebury.
Grist, Chas, Chiswell-st, Middx, Glass Merchant. Pet April 14. May 3
at 11. Dupree & Chapman, Lawrence-lane.
Harris, Wm Thos, Queenhithe, Wholesale Stationer. Pet April 9. May
3 at 12. Howard & Co, Fenchurch-st.
How, Wm, Marsham-st, Westminster, Grocer. Pet April 15. May 3 at
11. Webb, Jewry-st.
Hughson, Andrew Duncan, Penn-rd-villas, Holloway, Comm Agent. Pet
April 14. May 3 at 11. Wells, Moorgate-st.
James, Edwd, Wellington-borough, Butcher. Pet April 14. May 3 at 12.
Roscoe & Hincks, King-st, Finsbury, and Cook, Wellington-borough.
Johnson, Jas, New Church-st, Bermondsey, Lighterman. Pet April 15.
May 9 at 11. Silvester, Gt Dover-st.
Martin, Wm Hy Bragg, Bazelphons-st, Bermondsey, Cap Manufacturer.
Pet April 15 (for pan). May 3 at 12. Aldridge.
Nathan, Aaron, Woolwich, Clothier. Pet April 18. May 3 at 1. Solomon,
Finsbury-pl.
Poietti, Stephen, Dorris-st, Lambeth, Superintendent of Steam Boats.
Pet April 14. May 3 at 11. Hill Basinghall-st.
Sanders, Chas Walter, Cross-passage, Leadenhall-market, Meat Salesman.
Pet April 12. May 3 at 12. Dubois, Gresham-st.
Smalles, Thos, Clapton-sq, Hackney, Paymaster. Pet April 15. May 3 at
12. Lawrence & Co, Old Jewry-chambers.
Sutton, Geo, Holloway-pl, Holloway-rd, Victualler. Pet April 15. April
30 at 11. Stevens & King, Staple-inn.

To Surrender in the Country.

Blagg, John, Crewe, Boot Maker. Pet April 16. Nantwich, April 21 at
10. Salt, Tunstall.
Bradberry, Mermaidke, Wilsden, nr Bradford, Tailor. Pet April 14.
Leeds, May 2 at 11.15. Harle, Leeds.
Brooks, James, Swansea, Baker. Pet April 15. Bristol, April 29 at 11.
Field, Swansea, and Clifton & Brooking, Bristol.
Budden, Alex Gerrard, Clevedon, Somerset, Baker. Pet April 14. Bristol,
April 29 at 12. Clifton & Brooking, Bristol.
Burghardt, Edwd, March, Merchant. Pet April 8. Manch, May 2 at 12.
Sale & Co, Manch, and Wells & Ridsdigh, Bradford.
Clarke, Adam, Ledbury, Hereford, Butcher. Pet April 14. Ledbury,
May 2 at 12. Reece, Ledbury.
Cleworth, Benj, Hulme, Manch, Printer. Pet April 16. Salford, April 30
at 9.30. Swan, Manch.
Crosbie, Jas, Lpool, Joiner. Pet April 14. Lpool, May 7 at 11.
Dearlie, Wm, Landport, Portsea, Dealer in China. Pet April 15. Ports-
mouth, April 30 at 11. Cousins, Portsmouth.
Dixon, Jas, Lpool, Joiner. Adj April 14. Lpool, May 7 at 11.
Ely, John, Holbeck, nr Leeds, Comm Agent. Pet April 14. Leeds, May
4 at 12. Harle, Leeds.
Gardner, Robt, Westbromwich, Engineer. Pet April 16. Birm, May 6 at
12. Caddick, Westbromwich, and James & Griffin, Birm.
Gildroy, John, Northwood, Hanley, Stafford, Colliery Manager. Pet April
14. Hanley, May 7 at 11. Sutton, Baraleum.
Griffin, John, Walsall, Provision Dealer. Pet April 15. Walsall, May 3
at 11. Crump, Walsall.
Harris, Wm Chas, Eardisland, Hereford, Cattle Dealer. Pet April 2.
Birm, April 29 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.
Hatcher, Geo, Poole, Pork Butcher. Pet April 15. Poole, April 30 at 11.
Harker, Poole.
Hay, Geo Wilson, Worcester, Seed Merchant. Pet April 11. Birm, May
6 at 12. Clarke, Worcester.
Hine, Jane, Churchstons, Devon, Farmer. Pet April 15. Exeter, May
4 at 11. Clarke, Exeter.
Horrocks, Jas, Hulme, Lancaster, Tailor. Adj April 14. Manch, May 2
at 11. Gardner, Manch.
Jenkinson, Jacob, Yeardon, nr Otley, Cloth Manufacturer. Pet April 11.
Otley, April 30 at 12. Harle, Leeds.
Jones, Anewrin, Pontianfraith, Monmouth, Miller. Pet April 5. Bristol,
April 29 at 11. Press & Inskip, Bristol.
Jones, John, Llanwenarth, Monmouth, Miller. Pet April 15. Abergar-
venny, May 3 at 12. Sayce, Abergavenny.
Johnson, Hy, Birm, Coal Agent. Pet April 16. Birm, May 2 at 12.
Parry, Birm.
Johnston, John, Lpool, Provision Dealer. Pet April 15. Lpool, May 9 at
11. Husband, Lpool.
King, Joseph, Nottingham, Victualler. Pet April 16. Nottingham, May
25 at 11. Buttery, Nottingham.
Lay, Thos, Brierley-hill, Stafford, Miller. Pet April 14. Birm, May 2 at
12. Round, Tipton, and James & Griffin, Birm.
Mason, Hy, Bourn, Lincoln, Farmer. Pet April 13. Bourn, May 3 at 11.
Andrews, Bourn.
McNulty, Geo, Lpool, Poultry Dealer. Adj April 14. Lpool, May 7 at 11.
Mitchell, Richd, Leicester, Hosier. Pet April 8. Birm, May 4 at 12.
Dalton, Lancaster, and James & Griffin, Birm.
Moore, Geo, Gloucester, Baker. Pet April 13. Gloucester, April 22 at
12. Taynton, Gloucester.
Newbon, Walter, Longton, Stoke-upon-Trent, Builder. Pet April 14.
Stoke-upon-Trent, April 30 at 11. Tennant, Hanley.
Plumb, Jas, Wash, Newbury, General Dealer. Pet April 13 (for pan).
Reading, April 27 at 12. Smith, Reading.
Ramsdale, Ralph, Leigh, Lancaster, Provision Dealer. Pet April 16.
Leigh, May 4 at 1. Ambler, Leigh.
Richardson, Hy, New Shoreham, Sussex, Builder. Pet April 15. Bigh-
ton, May 2 at 11. Mills, Brighton.
Shawcross, John, Openshaw, Lancaster, Tobacco Manufacturer. Pet
April 15. Manch, May 2 at 9.30. Livett, Manch.
Stokes, John, Spittlegate, Lincoln, Butcher. Pet April 12. Grantham,
April 29 at 11. Palmer, Grantham.
Symonds, John, Kidderminster, Gamekeeper. Pet April 12. Kidder-
minster, April 30 at 11. Saunders, Kidderminster.
Tait, Wm Thornhill, Bridgwater, Draper. Pet April 15. Bridgwater,
May 4 at 10. Reed, Bridgwater.
Vincent, Saml, Churchstanton, Devon, Miller. Pet April 15. Exeter,
May 4 at 11. Smith, Honiton, and Daw & Son, Exeter.

Wilkinson, John Beadman, Bristol, Carrier. Pet April 15. Bristol, April 29 at 11. Clifton & Brooking, Bristol.
Winfield, John, Wellington, Salop, Victualler. Pet March 17. Birm, May 2 at 12. Taylor, Wellington, and Wright, Birm.
Wood, Geo, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Manch, Butcher. Pet April 14. Manch, May 2 at 9.30. Swan, Manch.
Yule, John Carlisle Duncan (and not Yale, as previously advertised).

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, April 15, 1864.

Barnes, Geo, Bollington, nr Macclesfield, Corn Dealer. April 11.
Belt, Rev Robt Wallis, Brompton-row, Brompton, Clerk. April 12.
Mason, Geo, North Somercotes, Lincoln, Farm Bailiff. April 9.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE MART.

April 15.—By Messrs. RUSHWORTH, JARVIS, & ABBOTT.
Freehold estate, comprising a residence, being No. 207, Marylebone-road, with premises, plot of ground, and four dwelling-houses in the rear; let on lease for a term of 75 years from June, 1859, and assigned for the same term at a ground-rent of £30 per annum—Sold for £3,000.
Leasehold residence, being No. 32, Grove-place, Brompton; term, 74 years from December, 1849, at a ground-rent of £7 10s. per annum—Sold for £255.
Leasehold, two dwelling-houses, one with shop, situate and being Nos. 81 and 82, High-street, Shadwell; term, 60 years from Michaelmas, 1830; ground-rent, £14 per annum—Sold for £95.

By Messrs. WILKINSON & HORNE.

Freehold estate, comprising a residence, stabling and coach-houses, &c., situate at Loughton, Essex—Sold for £4,900.

By Messrs. C. & H. WHITE.

Leasehold residence, No. 21, Trinity-square, Southwark; term, 31 years, unexpired; ground-rent, £12 1s. 6d.; let at £35 per annum—Sold for £295.

Leasehold residence, No. 22, Trinity-square; similar term and ground-rent; let at £42 per annum—Sold for £300.

Leasehold property, situate in Harris-street, Southampton-street, Camberwell; term, 77 years unexpired; and producing £335 8s. per annum—Sold for £1,750.

Leasehold, two houses, No. 1 & 2, Cottage-place, New-street, Vauxhall-street, Lambeth; term, 21 years from June last; ground-rent, £4 10s.; let for £20 16s. per annum—Sold for £75.

By Messrs. HARDS & VAUGHAN.

Leasehold residence, known as Tremorvale, situate in Upper Lewisham-road; held for 99 years from June, 1855, at a ground-rent of £14 per annum—Sold for £1,385.
Freehold plot of building land at Blackheath, Kent—Sold for £960.

Freehold house and shop, being No. 2, Crooms-hill, Greenwich; let for a term, at £55 per annum—Sold for £820.
Freehold residence, being No. 2, Catherine-place, Blackheath-road, Greenwich; let at £42 per annum—Sold for £370.

April 19.—By Messrs. DUBENHAM & TEWSON.

Freehold dwelling-house and two cottages, with premises adjacent, situate at Barkway, Herts; let at £40—Sold for £270.

By Messrs. HERRING, SON, & CLARE.

Leasehold residence, being No. 5, Holland-place, Clapham-road; term, 80 years from Michaelmas, 1819; apportioned ground-rent, £6 per annum; let at £25 per annum—Sold for £345.

Leasehold residence, being No. 7, Holland-place, aforesaid; held for a similar term; ground-rent, £7—Sold for £410.

Leasehold residence, being No. 44, Newington-place, Kennington-park; term, 99 years from Michaelmas 1787; ground-rent, £4 15s. per annum; let at £60 per annum—Sold for £490.

April 20.—By Mr. GODWIN.

Leasehold residence, being No. 18, Gloucester-villas, Brixton; let at £45 per annum; term, 87 years from Midsummer last; ground-rent, £8 per annum—Sold for £430.

April 21.—By Messrs. GARDEN & ELLIS.

Freehold premises, known as The Finsbury Dairy, Sunhill-row, Finsbury, together with goodwill of the business—Sold for £1,500.

AT GARRAWAY'S.

April 18.—By Messrs. DANIEL CROXIN & SONS.

Freehold residence, with about 6 acres of meadow and orchard land situate in High Bath-road, Hounslow—Sold for £27,100.

By Messrs. McLAREN & SON.

Lease, with possession of the Railway Tavern, situate at the Dartford Station—Sold for £710.

April 20.—By Messrs. FAREBROTHER, CLARK, & LYE.

Leasehold residence, being No. 76, Addison-road, Kensington; let for a term of 21 years from December, 1852, at £130 per annum; term, 88 years, unexpired; ground-rent, £25 per annum—Sold for £1,510.

Leasehold improved ground-rent of £20 per annum, issuing out of a residence being No. 43, Wimpole-street, Cavendish-square; term, 95 years from Lady-day, 1775—Sold for £100.

April 21.—By Mr. STANLEY ROBINSON.

Leasehold house, being No. 21, Canonbury-square, Islington; let at £45 per annum—Sold for £235.

Leasehold house, being No. 22, Canonbury-square; let at £45 per annum—Sold for £230.

Freehold allotment of ground, situate at Fililton, Beds, estimated annual value, £10—Sold for £40.

Freehold cottage, with garden and outbuildings, situate at Fililton, Beds; estimated annual value, £7—Sold for £110.

LAW UNION FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

CHIEF OFFICE, 126, CHANCERY-LANE, LONDON, W.C.

DUBLIN BRANCH, 11, DAME STREET.

SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL, ONE MILLION STERLING.

The FIRE and LIFE DEPARTMENTS are under ONE MANAGEMENT, but with SEPARATE FUNDS and ACCOUNTS.

Directors.

CHAIRMAN—SIR WILLIAM FOSTER, Bart.

DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN—Mr. SERJEANT MANNING, Q.A.S.

JAMES CUDDON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, 23, Sussex-square, Hyde-park.
JOHN WOOLLETT, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, 5, Brick-court, Temple.
CHARLES JOHN WHISHAW, Esq., Solicitor, 3, South-sq., Gray's-inn.
FRANCIS RIDOUT WARD, Esq., Solicitor, 1 Gray's-inn-square.
JOHN LAMBERT, Esq., Priestgate, Peterborough.
R. J. SISSON, Esq., Solicitor, St. Asaph.
H. MASON, Esq., Solicitor (Lindsay, Mason, & Fisher), 84, Basinghall-st.
J. MOLYNEUX TAYLOR, Esq., Solicitor, 51, Guildford-st., Russell-sq.
EDWARD BURKITT, Esq., Solicitor, Carriers' Hall, London Wall.
HENRY MUNSTER, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, 5, Paper-buildings, Temple.
J. COLE, Esq., 30, Rutland-gate, Hyde-park.
J. C. REES, Esq. (Firm Dorington, Ellicombes, & Co.), 6, Parliament-st.
CHARLES JOHN PALMER, Esq., Solicitor, Great Yarmouth.
J. F. ROBINSON, Esq., Solicitor, The Hall, Hadleigh, Suffolk.
HENRY S. WARBROUGH, Esq., Solicitor, Bristol.
HENRY HEFFILL, Esq., Solicitor, Dias, Norfolk.
JOHN BATTEN, Esq., Solicitor, Town Clerk, Yeovil.
HENRY TREMENEERE JOHNS, Esq., Solicitor, Ringwood, Hants.
JOHN F. MARSH, Esq., Solicitor, Warrington.
JOHN NAFSON, Esq., Solicitor, Town Clerk, Carlisle.
JOHN DABBS, Esq., Solicitor, Stamford.

Standing Counsel.

WILLIAM HAYES, Esq., 4, New-square, Lincoln's-inn.

Bankers.

THE UNION BANK OF LONDON, Temple-bar Branch.

Medical Advisers.

RICHARD QUAIN, Esq., M.D., London, F.R.C.P., 56, Harley-street, Cavendish-square.

HENRY HANCOCK, Esq., F.R.C.S., 37, Harley-street, Cavendish square.

Auditors.

R. P. HARDING, Esq., 3, Bank-buildings, Lothbury.

FIRE DEPARTMENT.

Capital, £750,000, in addition to the Premiums and Reserve Fund.

Business consists of the best classes of risks.

Government Discount on Duty allowed the insured.

Claims settled promptly and fairly.

Copies of the Directors' Report and the Balance Sheet, and every information may be obtained at the Chief Office, or at the Office of any of the Country Directors.

LIFE DEPARTMENT.

Capital, £250,000, in addition to the Premiums and Reserve Fund.

PREMIUMS MODERATE.

A Bonus every Five Years. Next Bonus in 1864; and all Policies effected on the "with profits scale" before September, 1864, will participate. The Bonus in 1850 amounted to 25 to 80 per cent. per annum on the Premiums paid, varying with the ages of the insured.

may be obtained at the Chief Office, or at the Office of any of the
FRANK M'GEDY, Secretary, 126, Chancery-lane.

London and Provincial Law Assurance Society.

The Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Proprietors of this Society

WAS HELD

AT THE OFFICE, 21, FLEET STREET, LONDON, ON SATURDAY AFTERNOON,

JAMES R. HOPE SCOTT Esq., Q.C., Chairman of the Board, Presiding.

Mr. A. DAY (the Actuary and Secretary) read the Notice convening the Meeting, and the Directors' Report.

The Directors, in meeting the Proprietors at the close of the eighteenth year of the Society's existence, have to report a progress more satisfactory than it has been their good fortune to announce on any previous occasion.

The new Policies effected number 195, assuring sums amounting in the aggregate to £243,580, and yielding in new Premiums the sum of £9,192 1s. Whether, as regards the number of Policies, Sums assured, or new Premiums, the increase upon any previous year is very considerable, the excess over 1852 being 38 in the number of Policies, £50,875 in Sums assured, and £1,559 7s. 7d. in new Premiums.

The average amount of the new Assurances is £1,250, and the average amount of existing Policies exceeds £1,100. The Assurances in force on 31st December, 1863, were for £1,607,783 15s. 8d.

By the annexed Balance-sheet it will be observed that the total Income of the Society for the year amounted to £61,592 15s., while the Expenses of Management were but £2,782 4s. 8d., being 4½ per cent. only on the total Income. The entire payments, inclusive of Claims, Dividends, &c., amounted to £30,794 17s. 4d., and the Assets have been increased by £30,797 17s. 8d., exactly 50 per cent. of the Income. The Directors feel that the Proprietors can desire no better test than this of the soundness of the business and the economy of its Management.

The amount of the Claims by Death was £15,369, assured by fourteen Policies upon eleven lives. Of these there were five of the Non-participating class, assuring £3,900; £10,000 were on the Bonus Class, but one of these, for £5,000, having fallen in after the payment of only one Premium, was not entitled to participate, and the Bonus additions on the remaining £5,600 were £869. Four of the Deaths were occasioned by purely accidental causes; but, nevertheless, the mortality is considerably lighter than might have been anticipated.

The Assets of the Society on the 31st December, 1863, amounted to £305,186 9s., and were invested on Securities yielding on the average £4 12s. 4d. per cent. per annum.

The Directors have to lament the loss of two of their number, Mr. HENRY LAKE and Mr. WILLIAM PARKER, whose deaths have occurred since the last Annual Meeting. The former had been one of the Society's earliest Directors and most earnest supporters, and, with Mr. PARKER, who had more recently joined the Board, was held in universal esteem.

Mr. BACON, Q.C., has also retired from the Board, in consequence of his inability through professional engagements to attend its Meetings.

The Directors who retire by rotation are MESSRS. ASHLEY, ERLE, HEDGES, HOPE SCOTT, LAW, LEFROY, LUCAS, STILL, and WHITE; they are all eligible for re-election.

The retiring Auditors are Mr. JOSHUA T. PAUL (Auditor for the Assured) and Mr. PHILIP ROBERTS (Auditor for the Proprietors), who are also eligible for re-election.

In conclusion, the Directors have only to add that, while they will earnestly endeavour to maintain the reputation and prosperity of what they believe to be one of the best Assurance Institutions, they would earnestly solicit the hearty and increased co-operation of the Shareholders and Assured.

April, 1864.

JAMES R. HOPE SCOTT, Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN said—Gentlemen, in rising to move the adoption of this report and balance-sheet, I am in the usual difficulty which I experience in this chair—that of having nothing to say of any great importance beyond what is contained in the report. We continue to advance, and to advance in a very sure and safe manner; and the only feature in this year's proceedings which appears to me to require notice (beyond a few details which I will mention to you presently) is that our position has attracted the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who, on a late occasion, classified a great many societies, naming some as first-class, and amongst these ours is mentioned. Of course, this is a great satisfaction to us, and demonstrates to the public that we are entitled to their confidence. (Hear, hear.) Now, gentlemen, the points to which Mr. Gladstone calls attention in his speech, and which, he says, will inform any one in a sufficient manner as to the condition of an assurance office, are these:—first of all, its date; secondly, its income from premiums; and thirdly, its accumulations. You have all that in the report and balance-sheet; and it is upon these three heads that he considers our position, and establishes it to be perfectly satisfactory. (Hear, hear.) There is another portion of his speech—which, however, I have not before me, but which is well worth bearing in mind in reference to our proceedings—namely, the question of the expenses of management. Any proprietor who has studied that question must have perceived that, in proportion to the unsoundness of companies is the largeness of their expenditure; and, while we are selected by the Chancellor of the Exchequer as a sound company, I wish he could have added the very low rate of our expenses of management. I believe there is hardly any society of the kind which can boast as we can do that, with the large annual increase of our business, our total expenses of management are as low as 4½ per cent. (Hear, hear.) In fact, our expenses remain pretty nearly stationary, whilst our business increases in a rapid and satisfactory manner. In regard to details, you have them, to a great extent, in this report, but I will mention one or two matters which are not so fully brought out. The new assurances are 195, and amount to £243,580 capital, and £9,192 premium. Now that is the best year that we have ever had. In 1862 we assured to the extent of £192,705, and we had premiums to the extent of £7,622. In 1861 we assured £152,100, and we had premiums to the extent of £6,077. Our best year, previous to this year, was 1860, and then we assured £230,640, and we got in premiums £8,296. So that in this, the eighteenth year of our existence, we have exceeded the best of any previous years; and I think, looking at the comparatively steady way in which the increase has been kept up, we must feel great confidence as regards the future of the company in this respect. (Hear, hear.) And in remarking upon this, I must, as usual, advert to the great assistance afforded by the directors, and also by the shareholders themselves, in procuring assurances. They seem to continue "neck and neck," so to speak, in assisting the society, by introducing new business. In 1863 the directors procured assurances to the extent of £39,300, and the shareholders introduced business to the extent of £46,550. This year the directors represent £41,950, and the shareholders £44,695. (Cheers.) I am glad that there is the same attention to the interest of the society still to be observed, both among the directors and shareholders, which characterized this office in former years. With regard to our existing assurances, they now amount, as you know from the report, to £1,607,784, while in 1862 they were £1,435,533, showing an increase of £172,151. (Hear, hear.) The expenses of management, on the other hand, which I have alluded to generally, were, in the year 1863, £2,775; and upon the increase of business which I have spoken of, the increase of the expenses of management is represented by the difference between £2,775 and £2,782 4s. 8d. (Cheers.) With regard to our investments, they yield an average rate of interest of £4 12s. 4d. per cent.; and I believe these investments have been made with perfect regard to security, and that no speculative investments have been taken. There is, therefore, great prudence exercised, and to that and the low rate of the expenses of management we may attribute the profit and the success of the society. (Hear, hear.) With regard to the claims,—on previous occasions I have noticed, and I think it my duty again to notice, that we certainly have not come in for the bad period yet, and we must be prepared for heavier claims at some future time. That of course must be the case, for, as we get older, the insured lives must get older too, and our death-claims will consequently be heavier. This year, as the report notices, it is singular that out of the eleven claims, four of them were caused by accidents. I think the total amount of claims due to accident, out of the £18,000, is £9,000; that is to say, four persons who were insured have died through accidents, and their claims amount to £9,000. Well, gentlemen, beyond the particulars I have mentioned to you, I have little to refer to, except the general question raised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his speech, to which I have referred. I think this society, if any, may join with the one quoted by Mr. Gladstone, in the House of Commons, in approving, or, at any rate, in not objecting to, his measure for granting small life assurances. The average amount of our assurances is £1,100 per policy, and, therefore, the measure which is directed only to assurances of £100 is certainly not likely to interfere with our business. (Hear, hear.) If it is successful, which is matter of speculation (hear, hear), in my opinion it will tend rather to support the large companies than to injure them, for I am sure a taste for insurance is a thing to be cultivated by every possible means, and when people in the lower classes have got the general feeling that insurance is a sound and proper thing, you will find this feeling will extend; and, if there should be many men to insure under the Chancellor of the Exchequer's scheme, it will be the means of suggesting to their masters that they should insure their own lives. (Hear, hear.) Far, therefore, from viewing this measure with any apprehension, which cannot in any degree affect the class of business which we transact, I look to it, if it is successful in passing, as a means of increasing our business generally. With these observations, I beg to propose to you the following resolution:—"That the report just read, together with the balance-sheet therein referred to, be received and adopted."

Mr. H. B. LAW (deputy chairman) seconded the resolution, which was unanimously passed.

The retiring Directors and Auditors were re-elected, and, after a vote of thanks to the Chairman, the meeting broke up.

Periodical Sale (established 1843), appointed to take place the first Thursday in every month, of Absolute and Contingent Reversions to Funded and other Property, Life Interests, Annuities, Policies of Assurance, Advowsons, Next Presentation, Manorial Rights, Rent Charges, Post Obitt Bonds, Debentures, Shares in Docks, Canals, Mines, Railways, Insurance Companies, and other public undertakings for the present year.

MR. MARSH begs to announce that his **PERIODICAL SALES** (established in 1843), for the disposal of every description of the above-mentioned PROPERTY, take place on the first Thursday in each month throughout the ensuing year, as under:—

May 5	July 7	October 6
June 2	August 4	November 3
	September 1	December 1

In addition to the above dates, Mr. Marsh also begs to announce that the following days are appropriated for the Sale of Freehold, Copyhold, and Leasehold Properties, viz:—

Thursday, April 28	Thursday, August 11, 18, 25
Thursday, May 12, 19, 26	Thursday, September 15
Thursday, June 9, 16, 23, 30	Thursday, October 20
Thursday, July 14, 21, 28	Thursday, November 17
	Thursday, December 15

2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house, London, E.C.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday, May 5.

MR. MARSH has received instructions from the Court of Chancery, in a suit of "Jorcy v. Jersey," to include in his next Monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY, MAY 5, at TWELVE, in Lots, FOUR DEBENTURE BONDS of the Briton Ferry Floating Dock Company, for £5,000 each, bearing interest at £5 per cent. per annum; a Bond for £50, bearing interest at £5 per cent. per annum, from the Trustees of the Easton and Bicester Turnpike Roads; and 100 £10 Shares, (fully paid up) of the Great Western and Brentford Railway Company. Particulars may be obtained at the Mart; of Messrs. FRESHFIELDS & NEWMAN, Solicitors, 5, Bank-chambers, Lothbury; of Messrs. FRERE, CHOLMELEY, & FOSTER, Solicitors, 28, Lincoln's-inn-fields; and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday, May 5.

MR. MARSH will include in his next Monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY, MAY 5, at TWELVE, in lots, 40 WATERLOO-BRIDGE ANNUITIES, of £7 each.

Particulars may be obtained at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday, May 5.

MR. MARSH has received instructions to include in his next Monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY, MAY 5, at TWELVE, a POLICY of ASSURANCE for £999 19s., effected in 1851 with the Gresham Life Assurance Society, on the life of a gentleman now in his 49th year.

Particulars may be obtained at the Mart; of Messrs. HUSON & PARKER, Solicitors, 4, King-street, Cheapside; and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday, May 5th.

MR. MARSH has received instructions from the Executor of the late Mrs. A. B. Maxton, to include in his next Monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY, MAY 5th, at TWELVE, a valuable POLICY of ASSURANCE for £500 (together with the bonuses added thereto, amounting to £58), effected in 1846 with the Law Life Assurance Society, on the life of a lady now in her 47th year.

Particulars may be obtained at the Mart; of Messrs. HILLIER & FENWICK, Solicitors, 12, Feuchurch-street, E.C.; and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday, May 5.

MR. MARSH has received instructions to include in his next Monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY, MAY 5, at TWELVE, a POLICY of ASSURANCE for the sum of £4,000, effected in 1855 with the Pelican Life Insurance Company on the life of a gentleman who will be 47 on the 5th of May next.

Particulars may be obtained at the Mart; of Messrs. RADCLIFFE & DAVIES, Solicitors, 20, Craven-street, Strand; of E. HARRIS, Esq., Solicitor, Rugby; and at Mr. Marsh's offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday, May 5.

MR. MARSH has received instructions from the Executors of the late J. Wood, Esq., to include in his next Monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY, MAY 5, at TWELVE, an old POLICY of ASSURANCE for £500 effected in 1835, with the Atlas Fire and Life Insurance Company, on the life of a gentleman now in his 54th year. Reduced annual premium, £8 9s. 1d.

Particulars may be obtained at the Mart; of Messrs. GELL & SON, Solicitors, Lewes, Sussex; and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843), of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday, May 5th.

MR. MARSH has received instructions to include in his next Monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY, MAY 5, at TWELVE, in One Lot, the REVERSION to a MOIETY of the SUM of £1,115 13s. 8d. £3 per Cent. Consolidated Annuities, and to a like Share of the Sum of £4,711 10s. 2d. £3 per Cent. Reduced Annuities, receivable on the decease of a lady, now in the 54th year of her age, provided a gentleman, aged 31, survives her; and a fully paid-up Policy of Assurance for £600, in the National Mercantile Assurance Society; and a Policy of Assurance for £1,000, in the same office, subject to an annual premium of £15 17s. 6d., both payable in the event of the decease of the said gentleman during the life of the said lady.

Particulars may be obtained at the Mart; of F. CHARSLEY, Esq., Solicitor, Slough, Bucks; and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sales of Absolute or Contingent Reversions to Funded or other Property, Annuities, Policies of Assurance, Life Interests, Railway, Dock, and other Shares, Bonds, Clerical Preferments, Rent Charges, and all other descriptions of present or prospective Property.

MR. FRANK LEWIS begs to give notice that his SALES for the year 1864 will take place at the AUCTION MART, on the following days, viz:—

Friday, May 13	Friday, September 9
Friday, June 10	Friday, October 14
Friday, July 8	Friday, November 11
Friday, August 12	Friday, December 9

Particulars of properties intended for sale are requested to be forwarded at least 14 days prior to either of the above dates, to the office of the auctioneer, 36, Coleman-street, E.C., where information as to value, &c., and printed cards of terms may be had.

Leasehold Houses and Ground-rents in Barton-crescent, Guildford-street, and Tavistock-square, for occupation and investment.

MR. PHILIP D. TUCKETT is instructed by the executors of the late proprietor to SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, London, on TUESDAY, the 10th day of MAY, at TWELVE, in Four Lots, the superior FAMILY RESIDENCE, with possession, known as 46, Burton-crescent, at the corner of Crescent-place, containing entrance-hall, dining, breakfast, and large double drawing-rooms, 5 bed-rooms, and ample domestic offices. The house and premises, No. 80, Guildford-street, containing large dining and double drawing-rooms, library, study, 6 bed-rooms, and usual offices; let on a repairing lease at £90 per annum; and two improved ground-rents of £10 and £3 15s. per annum, amply secured upon the houses No. 20 and 21, Tavistock-square.

Particulars may be obtained of Messrs. SYMES & SANDLANDS, Solicitors, 33, Fenchurch-street; or, with orders to view, of Mr. PHILIP D. TUCKETT, Land Agent and Surveyor, 75, Old Broad-street, E.C.

BROOKS & SCHALLER'S AUCTION SALES

of Estates, Houses, Ground-Rents, Reversions, Annuities, Advowsons, &c., will take place at GARRAWAY'S, on the first and last Tuesday of each month; a nominal charge made per lot to include all expenses. THE INDEX, published Monthly, of Estates, Country and Town Houses, Shootings, &c., to be LET or SOLD, is issued free on application. Auction and Estate Offices, 25, Chancery-street, St. James', London.

LONDON AND LANCASHIRE FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES.

Fire Capital, £1,000,000. — Life Capital, £100,000.
London: 73 and 74, KING WILLIAM STREET, E.C.
Liverpool: BROWN'S BUILDING, EXCHANGE.
With Home and Foreign Branches and Agencies.
Chairman—F. W. RUSSELL, Esq., M.P. (Chairman of the National Discount Company.)

The following extracts from the Reports for 1863 show the amount of business transacted:—

Premiums	£45,049
Being an Increase on the Previous Year of	£29,802
The Losses were	£22,410
And the sum added to the Reserve Fund, after payment of 5 per Cent. to proprietors, was	£12,000

LIFE.
The New Assurances number 378, for £313,500, and yielding in Premiums

£9,508

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES.
Home and Foreign Fire Insurances, undertaken on favourable terms.
Mercantile Insurances at reduced rates.
Life Policies Unchallengeable.
Freedom from Extra Premium for Foreign Residence.
Rates of Premium as low as consistent with safety.
Four-Fifths, or 80 per Cent., of the Profits divided amongst participating Policy-holders.
W. F. CLIREHUGH, General Manager.
JAMES E. GALE, Liverpool Secretary.

PROVINCE OF CANADA.—In accordance with

the terms of a commission received from his Excellency the Governor-General of Canada, the undersigned hereby gives notice that he has been appointed a commissioner under the Act passed in the Colonial Parliament, 26th Victoria, cap. 41, to administer oaths and take affidavits in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in or concerning any cause, matter, or thing depending or in anywise concerning any proceeding to be had in any court of law or equity or of record in the province of Canada. Affidavits to be used in any of the courts of law or equity in Canada. Also all affidavits verifying the execution of deeds relating to real estate requiring registration. And all affidavits for probate of wills can be sworn before the undersigned, and will be received without further proof by municipal or judicial seal of officers.

CHARLES SCHOFF.
19, Coleman-street, E.C., London, 15th April, 1864.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM & TEWSON'S CURRENT LIST OF ESTATES AND HOUSES, including landed estates, Town and Country residences, hunting and shooting quarters, farms, ground-rents, rent-charges, house property, and investments generally, may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 80, Cheapside, E.C., or by post for one stamp.

Particulars for insertion in the ensuing List must be received by the 26th at latest.

Important Notice—Shortland's Estate, Kent—A Registered and Indefeasible Title to every Lot.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM & TEWSON beg to inform the public that the option of having a registered title, under the Act of 1862, will be offered to the purchasers of lots on this estate, steps having already been taken by the vendor to obtain this advantage. The effect of a registered title will be to reduce the present and all future purchasers' legal expenses to an almost nominal amount. This is the first estate which has been brought into the market for sale with a REGISTERED AND INDEFEASIBLE TITLE UNDER THE NEW ACT, and the immense advantages thereof to all purchases, and especially those intending to deal with or build upon the land, can hardly be over estimated, as not only will the title be absolutely indisputable, but all sales of the whole or any portion, or of houses to be built thereon, will be as simple and inexpensive as the transfer of a ship, or money in the bank. This advantage, in addition to the attractions of the estate itself and the fact of the locality being one of the most favourite near London, cannot fail to render any building operation on an extensive scale an eminently successful speculation.

Particulars of
Messrs. BURCHELL, Solicitors, 5, Broad Sanctuary, Westminster; of JNO. WHICHCORDE, Esq., 16, Walbrook; of ROBERT RITCHIE, Esq., Architect, 7, Beaufort-buildings, Strand; and of the Auctioneers, 80, Cheapside.

Freehold Estate, Essex.

MR. ALEX. KIRKLAND is instructed to **SELL**, by PRIVATE CONTRACT, the Estate of **GLAZENWOOD**, consisting of about 50 acres of rich agricultural land, well timbered, lying within a ring fence, and situate about two-and-a-half miles from the Braintree, and five miles from the Witham Railway Stations. The mansion contains large entrance-hall, four reception rooms, eleven bedrooms, kitchens with complete accommodation for servants. The out-buildings are newly erected, and comprise double coach-house, stabling consisting of four loose boxes and six stalls, harness-room, hay-loft, &c. On the estate is a gardener's-house, farm-offices, and at the entrance is a well-built lodge. Five acres of the land are planted with beautiful American shrubs, and the avenue to the mansion is thickly planted with trees and shrubs of fine growth. The estate can also be let with immediate possession, but if sold, a considerable amount of the purchase-money can remain on mortgage.

Apply to **ALEX. KIRKLAND**, Land and Estate Agent, 3, Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn, W.C.

Wednesday next.—To Trustees, Capitalists, and others requiring a first-class Investment.—Valuable Freehold Ground-rent, secured upon the Alhambra Palace, formerly known as the Panopticon, in Leicester-square; with the Reversion thereof in about 47 years.

MR. MOXON begs to announce that he has been instructed to **SELL** by AUCTION, at the MART, on **WEDNESDAY** next, **APRIL 27**, at ONE, the highly important first-class FREEHOLD GROUND-RENT of £210 per annum, secured upon the magnificent edifice and noble pile of buildings, at present known as the Alhambra Palace, erected in 1852 in the most substantial manner possible, together with the two private residences, and all its accessories, at an outlay of £20,000. There is a frontage of 102 feet to the square, and the property extends back into Castle-street. The whole building is let on lease at the above ground-rent, for about 47 years still to run, when the purchaser would secure the reversion to one of the most important properties in the metropolis. Particulars may be obtained of

Messrs. DUNN & GAWTHROP, Solicitors, 2, Raymond's-buildings, Gray's Inn; and of **Mr. WM. MOXON, 3, St. Martin's-place, Trafalgar-square.**

Wednesday next.—To Trustees, Capitalists, and Others.—A valuable first-class Freehold Ground Rent, secured upon one of the best houses in Ashley-place, and sold under the Westminster Improvement and Incumbered Estate Act, 1861.

MR. MOXON will **SELL** by AUCTION, at the MART, near the Bank of England, on **WEDNESDAY** next, **April 27**, at ONE, the FREEHOLD GROUND RENT of £140 per annum, simply secured upon the fourth and best house in Ashley-place, numbered from 21 to 29, the annual rental value being £200, and to the reversion of which the purchaser will be entitled.

Particulars and plans may be obtained of
Messrs. MAYHEW & SALMON, Solicitors, 30, Great George-street; of Mr. C. W. JACQUES, 4, Victoria-street; at the Mart; and of Mr. WM. MOXON, 3, St. Martin's-place, Trafalgar-square.

Freehold and Leasehold Properties, producing about £735 per annum.

MESSRS. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST have received instructions to offer for sale at the MART, in MAY next, in Lots, a variety of small FREEHOLD and short LEASEHOLD PROPERTIES, situate in William's-court and Pitt's-place, Great Guildford-street; East-street, Walworth; Devonshire-road, Bethnal Green; New Kent-road; Pitt-street, St. George's-road; St. George's-place, Walworth-road; Apollo-buildings, East-street, Walworth; Walworth Common; and Portland-place, Clapham-road, the whole in the occupation of various tenants, at rents producing together a gross income of about £735 per annum; also two Copyhold Houses situate in Market-place, Winslow, Bucks, producing £240 per annum.

May be viewed and particulars had at the Elephant and Castle, Newington-butts; of

H. STURMY, Esq., Solicitor, Hibernia-chambers, London-bridge; at the Mart; and of Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST, 62, Old Broad-street, Royal Exchange, E.C.

Freehold and Leasehold Ground-rents, amounting together to about £136 per annum.

MESSRS. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST have received instructions to offer for SALE, at the MART, in MAY next, in Lots, a variety of small FREEHOLD and short LEASEHOLD GROUND-RENTS, amounting together to £136 per annum, secured upon properties situate in William's-court, Great Guildford-street; New-street, Horsleydown; London-road; Apollo-buildings, East-street, and Manor-place, Walworth; and West-square, Southwark; a detailed statement of which will appear in the particulars.

May be viewed, and particulars had of
H. STURMY, Esq., Solicitor, Hibernia-chambers, London-bridge; at the Mart; and of Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST, 62, Old Broad-street, Royal Exchange, E.C.

Crown Lands, Twickenham, Middlesex.

MESSRS. DRIVER & Co. are instructed by the Hon. Charles Gore, the Commissioner of her Majesty's Woods, Forests, &c. in charge of her Majesty's Land Revenue, under the authority of the Lords Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury, to **SELL** by AUCTION, at the MART, near the Bank of England, on **FRIDAY, MAY 6**, at ONE o'clock precisely, in Two Lots, 23a. 3r. 17p. of valuable MEADOW LAND, divided into five enclosures, and lying on each side of Isleworth Mill River, immediately adjoining Chase-bridge, on the high road to Whittton, and within one mile of the Twickenham Station on the South-Western (Windsor) Railway. The land is freehold and land-tax redeemed, and is now in the occupation of Mr. William Tegg, under a lease which will expire on the 10th October next, when possession will be given to the purchaser.

Plans and particulars may be had at the Office of Woods, &c.; and of
HORACE WATSON, Esq., solicitor, Whitehall-place; of JOHN CLUTTON, 9, Whitehall-place; at the Railway Hotel, Twickenham; at the Mart; and of Messrs. DRIVER & Co., Surveyors, Land Agents, and Auctioneers, 4, Whitehall, S.W.

The Forde Abbey Estate, Dorsetshire.—An exceedingly valuable and highly distinguished Freehold Domain, of great historic and antiquarian interest, embracing the stately pile of mediæval buildings, constituting, prior to the Reformation, one of the most renowned monastic establishments in the west of England, but now converted into and considered one of its celebrated family seats. The Abbey retains many of its original features and appendages. It is a fine ecclesiastical group, of Tudor style, and presents a most imposing exterior. It has two entrances, one under a magnificent old porch, opening into the great hall or refectory, a vestibule, cloister, Norman chapel, great and smaller dining rooms, great and smaller drawing-rooms, morning-room, &c., grand saloon with walls hung with the celebrated arras tapestry from the cartoons of Raphael, besides which there are principal bed-rooms, dressing-rooms, &c., the usual domestic offices, cellars, stabling, coach-house, and other out-door offices. The Abbey is surrounded by well-dressed and extensive lawns, pleasure-grounds, shrubberies, ornamental waters, fruit and flower gardens, fernery, hothouse, vinery, conservatory, and pinery, bounded by the river Axe, renowned for its salmon and trout fishing, and delightfully placed in a beautifully timbered park (lately a deer park), in which is the celebrated Abbot's-walk, a straight avenue 620 yards in length. This picturesque and highly interesting domain comprises 1,473 acres (upwards of 1,200 being title free), about half of which are rich grass lands, and the remainder (except about 100 acres of wood) are exceedingly productive arable land, divided into suitable farms, in a high state of cultivation, and the lands, where necessary, have been underdrained with pipes. The homesteads are in excellent order, and there are numerous cottages. There is building stone on the property and a brick-yard. The estate is studded with fine and stately timber, and interspersed with woodlands. It is three miles from Chard, six from Ilminster, seven from Axminster, seven from Crewkerne, twelve from Lyme, and only one mile from Chard-road Station, on the South-Western Railway. The rental value of the Abbey estate, including the Abbey and woods and lands in hand, may be fairly estimated at £3,000 per annum at least.

MESSRS. DRIVER & Co. have been instructed to submit to AUCTION, in London, in the Summer (unless previously disposed of by private contract, for which they have full instructions to treat), the above unique and highly distinguished FREEHOLD PROPERTY. More descriptive advertisements will shortly appear.

Printed particulars, with plans and views, are preparing, and may be had, when the day of sale is fixed; meantime further information can be obtained at the offices of Messrs. DRIVER & Co., Surveyors, Land Agents, and Auctioneers, 4, Whitehall, London, S.W.; of

Messrs. OSBORNE, WARD, & Co., Solicitors, Bristol; of Messrs. SALTER & CLARK, Solicitors, Chard; and of Mr. O. STUBBS, Land Agent, Hinton St. George; and of those offices photographs and drawings may be seen.

Vauxhall-gardens Estate, Lambeth, Surrey.—Valuable Freehold Building Land, arranged in lots, suitable for the erection of shops, residences for operatives, factories, and business premises; also Ground Rents, amounting to £460 per annum.

MESSRS. DRIVER & Co. are instructed by the Mortgagees, under power of sale, to submit to AUCTION, at the MART, near the Bank of England, on **FRIDAY, MAY 20**, in numerous lots, to suit the convenience of purchasers, some very valuable FREEHOLD BUILDING LAND, situate in the parish of St. Mary, Lambeth; comprising a considerable portion of the site of the late Royal Vauxhall-gardens, and having frontages upon Kennington-lane, Vauxhall-walk, and several new roads and streets, called Auckland-street, Burnett street, Brunel-street, Leopold-street, Gt. street, and Italian-walk. The Vauxhall Station, on the South-Western Railway, and the River Thames are close to the property, affording ready access from all parts, as well as facilities for the transit of goods. The sale will also include several lots of ground-rents, amounting together to £460 per annum.

Detailed particulars, with plans, may be obtained at the Royal Vauxhall Tavern, and other inns in the neighbourhood; at the Auction Mart; of

Messrs. KEMPSON & TROLLOPE, Solicitors, 31, Abingdon-street, Westminster; and of Messrs. DRIVER & Co., Surveyors, Land Agents, and Auctioneers, 4, Whitehall, London, S.W.

